philosophy of DAYANANDA

DR. VED PRAKASH GUPTA

PHILOSOPHY OF

About the Book

The present work brings an exposition of the philosophical views of Dayananda. It deals with other things a highly illuminating and enlighting knowledge of the concept of God in Vedas; sets at rest the pseudo-conflict among six systems of Vedic philosophy as shown by some thinkers. Besides, the book presents a masterly exposition of Vedic realism, which contains spritualism—sole remedy to the sufferings of mankind and solution of the conflicts and confrontation ridden modern civilization.

The book critically examins Dayanand's concept of soul and vividly presents his advocacy of immortality of soul, his freedom in action but dependent on God for its fruits, thus making and moulding his own destiny and having no scope for determinism and fatalism deep rooted in different religious concepts and philosophies.

Maharishi Dayananda had unflinching faith in the blending of science and philosophy. He very firmly expressed that science and philosophy are two inseparable aspects of one truth. For Dayananda world is a reality and not a phantasm as Shankara has advocated. This finds a masterly exposition in this book.

Lastly, the book deals with Dayanada's psychological and ethical views which again are based upon the Vedas.

1986 Rs. 100-00

OM

PHILOSOPHY OF DAYANANDA

By

Dr. Ved Prakash, Ph. D.
Department of Philosophy
MEERUT COLLEGE, MEERUT.
(Author of Dayanand-Darshan)

Publishers :
INDO-VISION (Pvt.) LTD.
II A-220, Nehru Nagar
GHAZIABAD, U. P. (India)
1986

Published By :
INDO-VISION (Pvt.) LTD.
II A-220, Nehru Nagar
GHAZIABAD-201 001 U. P.
(India)

FIRST EDITION (English) 1986

Price : Rs. 100/-

Printer :
NAVYUGANTAR PRESS
Sharda Road,
Meerut-250 002
Phone : 8212, 8921
Telex : 0594-238 NAVY-IN

PREFACE

In the nineteenth century, after a lapse of one thousand years, India produced a Seer and Vedic Rishi, in the person of Maharishi Dayananda. Sankaracharya had propagated the theory of non-dualism which established the supremacy of vedant philosophy in the world. But this philosophy could not produce any reformist stir in Indian society. This was dominantly a philosophical movement which established its supremacy over Buddhism, Jainism and other non-vedic religions. Consequently Buddhism almost disappeared from India—its birthplace. But Indians never forgot Lord Buddha. Lord Buddha was accepted as a great spiritual preacher. His main task was to reform a degenerate Hindu Society riddled with many superstitions, misconceptions and dogmatic ritualism. It appears to be a universal rule that in the absence of some enlightened seer or a true guide, mankind forgets the eternal values of life and starts following the path of supre-stitions. Then degeneration comes and mankind plunges into sufferings. To overcome the difficulties and remove the sufferings, enlightened souls come on the earth. Dayananda was such a soul.

Swami Dayananda came on the earth at a time when moral values had totally lost their significance, religion had degenerated and mankind was suffering from untold miseries. Dayananda showed the right path. He taught the religion of ancient rishis contained in the Vedas. A religion based on purely scientific thinking. His approach towards the Vedas was rationalistic and scientific. Dayananda declared that everybody is endowed with reason, therefore, man should apply his reason to every thing or problem he confronts in his life. Therefore, his approach in religion was also rationalistic. No doubt, in accepting this, he was indebted to ancient Vedic rishis, who themselves believed in free rational thinking. According to Dayananda, superstition and acceptance of traditions without rational relevance must have no place in man's life, be it sanctioned by religious authority, howsoever great. This is philosophical thinking in right earnest.

Dayananda's concepts on religion and the social set-up were based on his philosophical thinking. Philosophy, for him, was the instrument of arriving at truth. Therefore, he subjected spiritual, social, moral, religious, political and other problems of human life to rigorous philosophical analysis. And we find that his approach was correct. He was successful in resolving many ontological, social and spiritual anomalies in thinking. He uprooted malpractices and superstitions from religion and vehementely attacked unhealthy and inhuman customs i. e. untouchablity, caste-concept and child marriage. He established the idea of equal social status and brought repect to women. He was actually an emancipator of women. We find that Dayananda was a political thinker also. He propagated the idea of political freedom among the Indians. Through his lectures and writings, Dayananda awakened the masses against the foriegn rule. His predicaments, later on, became the watch-words of freedom fighters. All of his social, spiritual and religious concepts were the results of his rational thinking i. e. philosophy.

I, therefore, in this book have tried to give an exposition of his realism. My effort is aimed at showing the philosophical basis of Dayananda's many faceted intellectual ingenuity.

The present book is the modified form of my thesis which was approved for the Ph. D. degree by Agra University. Perhaps it was the first systematic effort which introduced Dayananda's philosophy to the academicians. Now this philosophy of Dayananda is being taught in many Universities. Some of them have established special departments and chairs to propagate and undertake research into his thought.

Originally this book was printed in Hindi. It found a large number of readers. On the demand of English readers from India and abroad it has been translated into English. In this task of English translation my friend and colleague Prof. Vinod Kumar of English department, Meerut College, Meerut, has helped me a lot. I am extremely indebted to him.

It is not an exaustive work on Dayananda's philosophy. It can only serve as a frame work. I hope the readers will feel at liberty to point out the shortcomings in it.

—Ved Prakash

CONTENTS

गायन्ति त्वा गायत्रिणोऽर्चन्त्यर्कमर्किणः ।

ब्रह्माणस्त्वा शतक्रत उद्वंशमिव येमिरे ॥ R. Veda 1-10-1

O, Doer of innumerable actions and Omniscient Lord ! some worship You by singing, others by constantly studying the Vedas and still others worship You by revealing and spreading Thy knowledge.

Dedicated

To

Late

SWAMI ATMANANDA SARSWATI

A Seer, Philosopher and Saint

1

Dayananda and the Vedas

The Vedas occupy a very significant place in the life of Aryans. It is from antiquity that the Vedas have been accepted as divine knowledge and therefore worthy of reverence and worship. But the Vedic hymns are supremely profound and mysterious. They have a unique rhythmic structure which conceals universal knowledge within them. Because of this profundity and unique rhyme scheme, their secrets are not discoverable by even an intellect steeped in Sanskrit knowledge, to say nothing of the average mind. It is for this reason that the technique of composing commentaries on the Vedas was adopted. Tradition tells us that Ravana was the first commentator, but his composition is no longer available in its entirety, Among the succeeding commentators, the best known are Skanda Swami, Udagitha, Vararuchi, Bhattabhaskar, Mahidhara, Uwatta and Sayana. Of their commentories, the most renowned is that of Sayana, and its influence can easily be seen on those of his successors. But Sayana's commentary on the Vadas failed to provide a suitable exposition of the soul of the Vedas and the evolution of thought in them. This commentary is dominated by ritualism, because the obssession with the rituals described in the Vedas has led to the complete neglect of the real meaning and intention of Vedic hymns,[1] which are essentially symbolic of universal knowledge and science. In consequence Sayana's commentary has imposed an exteremely narrow interpretation on the real intention of the Vedic hymns. Besides, it has rendered the great prestige and the inherent knowledge of the Vedas irrational.

In the nineteenth century, European scholars, basing their interpretations of the Vedas on Sayana's commentary, evolved a new evolutionist viewpoint. According to this the Vedas are a

historical account of the development of the Aryan race from its beginnings. This exposition by European scholars is naturalistic, it is derived from the naturalistic thoughts discoverable in Sayana's commentary. Although these scholars were courageous, influential and capable of unrestrained flights of fancy, their grand talent and imagination failed to solve the profound riddles of the Vedas. The main reason was that they failed to comprehend the language, rhyme scheme and the immortal poetry of the Vedas. In their commentaries, by relating the allagories described in the Vedas to the mythological tales and historical facts in the Brahmanas, Upanishads and Puranas, they raised an elaborate system of thought composed of Vedic mythology, Vedic history and Vedic culture. In addition, by using the technique of linguistic science, they sought to relate these to Greek literature, and in the attempt they created a comparative mythology and comparative philology. These European scholars reached these conclusions for three reasons—1. They did not possess adequate and intimate knowledge of Vedic tradition and literature, and they also abandoned the path of the ancient sages *i. e.* the mathod of Nirukta, 2. their guide was the commentary of Sayana, and 3. they lacked genuine empathy for the Vedas,[2] which alone could have inspired them to delve into the truth of Indian sciences. In the absence of any guiding principle which could provide a clue to the real intent of the Vedas, the western scholars, in their attempt to formulate their conception of Vedic thought, relied mainly on guesses and surmises. Sri Aurobindo went so far as to say pungently that the Vedic philosophy of western thinkers is built upon the shifting sands of imagination.[3]

An evaluation of both the forementioned attempts, the eastern and the western, makes it clear that according to Sayana, the Vedas are a compendium of rituals in which the hymns bear no mutual relationship. On the other hand, the western thinkers incline to the view that the Vedas are a record of the mental evolution of the Aryan race from prehistoric times to the period of the Upanishads, a record which has been given a poetic form by Vedic poets. They find it devoid of any profound thought. Instead, to them, it appears as a collection of the songs of barbaric, ancient and savage

cowherds.[4] The creators of the Vedas worshipped the powers of nature, and performed rituals to invoke their blessings and to be spared of their wrath; the Vedic sages were foolish though devoted worshippers.[5] The Vedas are purely mythological,[6] while all philosophical elements emerged later in the Upanishads, According to these thinkers, the Vedas manifest polytheism rather than monotheism. They find evidence of non-vegetarianism in the Vedas, the provisions for the sacrifice of animals in yagnas, acceptance of gambling and the consumption of alcoholic liquor then known as Soma.

By the time of Swami Dayananda, all these Indian and western viewpoints had undergone considerable evolution. Dayananda observed that both these viewpoints, instead of bringing to light the profound mysteries of the Vedas, served only to propagate a distorted interpretation of them. In consequence Vedic philosophy and culture were being stigmatized and denigrated. In reaction to this, in the nineteenth century, Swami Dayananda —who was a contemporary of Max Muller-propounded the third major viewpoint regarding the Vedas which differed completely from that of Sayana and the western thinkers. He refused to accept the Vedas either as a document of Vedic ritualism or as the songs of a barbaric Aryan race. He had two basic assumptions regarding the Vedas— 1. At the beginning of creation, God had enlightened the minds (अन्त: करण) of four sages, named Agni, Angira, Vayu and Aditya with the knowledge of the Vedas for the enlightenment and welfare of mankind, and. 2. the Vedas, being the comprehensive and infinite knowledge of God or the divine entity,contain all knowledge in its nascent form within themselves and consequently, the Vedas are self-evident. These assumptions were formulated after a profound analysis of Vedic literature by Swami Dayananda.

Proofs in the Divine Knowledge of the Vedas

Dayananda's assumption that the Vedas contain divine knowledge, or that they are of divine origin, has to be examined by us in two ways—first, on the basis of evidence available in Vedic literature, such as Brahmana, Upanishads, and philosophic texts, and second, on the basis of logical argumentation.

(a) Evidence from Vedic Literature— As far as the question of Vedic literature is concerned, the entire volume of it supports Dayananda's contention that the Vedas contain within themselves eternal and universal truths, and that God brought them into light in the pure consciences (अन्त: करण) of sages, at the beginning of creation. The Shatapatha Brahmana states that the knowledge of Rigveda was emblazoned upon the sage Agni, the Yajurveda upon the sage Vayu, and the Samaveda upon the sage named Surya.[7]

In the same way, Shvetashvetaropanishad, the Manusmriti, Vaisheshika Shastra, Yoga, Sankhya, Vedanta and others all unanimously consider the Vedas to have originated from God, and consequently they consider them self-evident.[8]

However, such a view poses a problem and raises some uncertainty because in the Vedas, the names of the sages who envisioned them are conjoined to the specific mantras or formulae they envisioned. In consequence, this has misled scholars into assuming that these formulae are the creations of men. They argue that every mantra or formula in the Vedas bears the name of its progenitor, and consequently, they are the creations of men.

In answer to this view, Swami Dayananda advocates the view that the sages whose names are conjoined to the formulae (Mantras) are not their creators, but the seers to whom these formulae were revealed by God.[9] In Swami Dayananda's view, the seer is that sage who manifested the secret of the formula, (Mantra) or in other words, the sage is the one who has brought its meaning to light. Looking at the original Vedas, we find that the names of sages are given alone with the formulae (Mantras). In fact, certain Vedic formulae bear the name of even a hundred sages, while other formulae have been repeated at a number of places in the Vedas. In such cases, the repetitions bear the names of different sages at different places. In view of these facts, it would be inappropriate and unsafe to accept the imaginary interpretation of Vedic evolution. If we accept such a view, we must answer the question whether the same formula (Mantra) was created by many different sages at different periods. In our opinion, such a formulation contradicts both commonsense and Vedic wisdom. This difficulty can be resolved only when the sages are treated as

seers, or diviners of divine knowledge. This is exactly what Nirukta states, when he says "the seer is one who realizes the truth." (N. 1—19) 'साक्षात्कृत धर्माण ऋषियो बभूवुः' The great vedic thinker of the modern period, Sri Aurolbindo also agree, with Swami Dayananda on this issue.[10]

Secondly. even if we consider this issue from the logical and argumentative standpoint, we must accept that there is prime need for some knowledge in an initial, latent, nascent or seed form, which can give rise to human knowledge in future. Evolutionists offer the explanation that Vedas, rather than being divine knowledge, provide no more than an account of the intellectual development of the Aryans, a development they had acquired over many centuries. They oppose the concept of any universal or external knowledge. Maharishi Dayananda completely rejects this evolutionary theory. He argues that just as a plant does not sprout without a seed, knowledge, too, cannot develop and evolve without some pre-existing knowledge, which acts like a seed. For example, if a new-born child is deprived of all human contact by being placed in an environment in which he converses with no human beings and also receives his food without human contact, then one can question whether he can himself give rise to any kind of knowledge.[11] In our opinion, it is impossible for knowledge to arise under such conditions. Incontrovertible proof of this can be found in the case of human children brought up by animals, some of whom have occasionally been discovered by hunters.[12] The second concrete example before us is that of the African continent. When the European races penetrated into the depths of the African jungle, they met many native races, whose behaviour bore a close similarity to that of animals. But within a few years of their contact with the European races the same tribals found a place among the civilized tribes. If the evolutionary doctrine were correct, these races and tribes should also have themselves developed some science and knowledge. But this was not found to be the case. The Africans have derived knowledge from the European races and then developed it. Concerning the Vedas, Swami Dayananda also stated that just as human beings lack real knowledge when they are in a vast forest, and consequently reflect bestial tendencies in their behaviour, the entire human race faces a similar condition

in the absence of the light of the Vedas.[13] The preceding analytical argument indicates that some divine knowledge, which can be the seed of human knowledge, is absolutely essential.

The second of Swami Dayananda's contentions concerning the Vedas is that they contain all knowledge. In this connection, Swami Dayananda argues that since the Vedas are divine in nature, that is, they are the knowledge of God they are complete in themselves. Secondly, since God provided this knowledge for the enlightenment and welfare of human beings, it should contain all knowledge that can be useful to human beings.

The Subject Matter of the Vedas

Dayananda has classified the knowledge contained in the Vedas into four classes— first, transcendental knowledge ,(विज्ञान) second action (कर्म),third, worship (उपासना) and fourth, science (ज्ञान)[14]

Transcendental knowledge(विज्ञान)-- By transcendental knowledge Dayananda implies the knowledge of ultimate realities i.e God, Jiva and matter etc. This is the process or method of knowledge in which the proper utilization of knowledge, action and worship can lead to a direct realization of God and other realities of the world—even the smallest object and the attainment of both worldly emancipations as well as salvation.

In this way, transcendental knowledge (विज्ञान) becomes then main subject of the Vedas. Swami Dayananda believes that transcendental knowledge (विज्ञान) too, has two forms (1) precise knowledge of God and obedience of his instructions and (2) knowledge of matter, which means knowing the qualities, and uses of material objects. Of these two, Dayananda believes that the main subject that the Vedas aim at is the knowledge of God.[15]

Action— In action, Dayananda includes those set of actions and rituals which lead to the attainment of spiritual and social welfare. In this class, he includes not only religious rituals like yagnas, but all the social and ethical activities of life.[16]

Worship— This relates to all measures adopted for the realization of God.

Science— Science (ज्ञान) means using the knowledge of the qualities of all materials from the earth to the atom, that is, all natural elements, to accomplish one's goal.[17] This can be interpreted in the sense of modern science. In Vedic terminology, vijyan means transcendental knowlede, in other words the knowledge of God and soul, while the word knowledge (ज्ञान) pertains to natural sciences.

Whether the Vedas contain natural science or not is a matter for serious research. Till the present, no organization has taken up the task of systematically and profoundly searching for scientific facts in the Vedas. Consequently, we do not possess any concrete proof to establish that scientific knowledge forms a part of the Vedas. Although Dayananda in his book "Rigvedadibhashyabhumika" has sought to argue that there is proof of knowledge concerning electricity, telegraphy, aeronautics, geography, geophysics, mathematics and other sciences in Vedic formulae (mantras). In the nineteenth century, many of these sciences had not evolved even in Europe, while wireless telegraphy and aeronautics had not even been born. In such circumstances, Swami Dayananda's propagation of such sciences on the basis of Vedic knowledge clearly indicates that the Vedas do contain the knowledge of natural sciences in their nascent form. However, serious effort is needed to elucidate and establish such a view. Sri Aurobindo, the great Yogi and scholar of the modern age has gone a step forward than Dayananda while he says that,"I will even add my own conviction that the Veda contains other truths of science the modern world does not at all possess, and in that case Dayananda has rather understated the depth and range of the Vedic wisdom."[18] Here Sri Aurobindo is hinting at such subjects as psychology. Vedic psychology is in itself astonishing, and forms a seed for the Yogic knowledge developed later.

Apart from natural sciences, the Vedas are also a repository of knowledge about ethics politics and political duties (Raj-Dharma), social laws (Samaj-Dharma), yoga and other subjects,

In this way, we arrive at the conclusion that all forms of knowledge and science exist in latent form in the Vedas, and that in the later Vedic texts, the sages have only interpreted and elaborated upon this knowledge.

The main consequence of Dayananda's herculean efforts in exploring Vedic knowledge was that the Vedas, which so far had been regarded as a text of rituals under the influence of Sayana or as texts containing naturalistic records according to western scholars, containing the forms of worship of natural forces, came to be recognized as a book containing spiritual and divine knowledge. It thus came to be seen as a text containing a scientific and ethical religion meant for human beings, the purpose of which was to provide true guidance for man's spiritual and worldly progress and emancipation. In this way approach of Dayananda in the Vedas is a great hope for mankind.

Dayananda's Method of Commentary on the Vedas

The Brahmanas and the Upanishads contain an elaboration of the mysteries of the Vedas. These were the first texts in which the sages conducted researches into vedic formulae on the basis of the principles discovered in the formulae themselves. In the Brahmanic texts, the sages protected the most minute and detailed rituals described in the vedic mantras, while the Upanishadic sages sought to bring to light the profound and subtle spiritual knowledge concealed in the Vedas, the knowledge which is the true vedic subject. The Brahmana texts not only seek to describe the vedic rituals but also to elaborate upon their spiritual significance. The formulae of the Vedas are symbolic and allegorical and poetic. These texts seek to decode the symbolic and allegorical meanings of the vedic language but their attention is limited to ritualism. On the other hand, the Upanishads focus their attention on spiritual knowledge or knowledge of Brahman, or divine knowledge. They resuscitated the Brahman which they found in vedic formulae through their spiritual insight or meditation (Samadhi), and thus laid emphasis upon divine knowledge as the path leading to salvation or moksha. For the Upanishadic sages, the mantras of the Vedas served as the root or seed for their philosophy and thinking.

In all these texts, a special technique has been adopted to discover the real nature and meaning of vedic words, and to interpret their meaning correctly in the context of the true vedic sentiment. In this method, attention is focussed mainly on the

meaning of the root of the word, Many vedic words. as they appear in the mantras. bear numerous meanings. which continue to vary according to the context in which they occur. Consequently, a correct interpretation of their meaning is possible only if we have recourse to the root of the word. For example. the word 'yagna' is taken to mean the lighting of fire and offering oblation into it for the purpose of completing a specific religious ceremony. If, however, we glance at the meaning of its root, we discover that the word can be used for every good kind of act. It is stated in the Shatpath Brahmana that "the yagnas (rituals as well as all virtuous deeds) are the best deeds of life." 'यज्ञो वै श्रेष्ठतमं कर्म' (S. Br. 1 – 7 – 1 – 5) The root 'yaja' means, worship of god, giving of alms and extending of co-operation (sangatikarna). In the Taitriya Brahmana, all creation (bhuvans) has been referred to as yagna, saying that, "creation is a great yagna of God" 'यज्ञो वै भुवनम्' (T. Br. 3 — 3 — 7 — 5) From this, the seer who has interpreted this formula seems to imply that the entire universe, being a creation of God, is a big yagna. Thus, it appears that the Brahmanic and Upanishadic texts direct us to percieve that if the meaning of the Vedas is to be understood, not much help can be expected from the conventional nature and form of language. In order to explicate the symbolism of the Vedas and to comprehend its various allegories, the interpretation of vedic words should be such that it perceives the relationship between the word and its root. This is called the yogic meaning. The seer of Nirukta intepretes vedic terminology in precisely this manner. Concerning the word 'deva,' for instance, Nirukta states that one who gives in charity is deva, one who gives light is deva, one who imparts knowledge is deva, one who exits in inter-stellar space is deva. (Nirukata 7 — 15) According to this, anything that possesses any one of the preceding qualities enters the category of deva, irrespective of its being living or non-living.

Maharishi Dayananda also adopted this technique of Nirukta in his vedic commentary.[19] He accepts that vedic words are etymological (yogic) in nature, not fixed or conventional. Yogic words are those that depend upon their root for the determination of their meaning. Words become rigid or 'roori'

when they become conventionally tied to some object, or delimited in their meaning through convention. The word 'vraka', (वृक) for instance, conventionally refers to wolf with the result that its mention immediately evokes the picture of this animal. But the meaning of its root is — that which rips apart, dissects or rends into pieces. The wolf belongs to this category because of its destructive nature. But in the Vedas, the word 'vraka' does not invariably refer to or explicate only this animal. We can use the word for any living being which possesses a similar nature, a comparable destructive tendency. Vedic words have very frequently been used in this way. Consequently, Dayananda's approach is entirely appropriate. With his divine insight, he was able to identify the fundamental mistake made in vedic interpretations, and consequently, he declared emphatically that one must tread the path of the ancient sages and seers to arrive at the true meaning of the Vedas, because it was on this basis that they had discovered the spiritual and scientific truths of the Vedas. Seeing the propriety of Dayananda's linguistic approach, the great Yogi Sri Aurobindo declared that Dayananda had gifted to the present generation the fundamental formula concerning the linguistic secrets of the sages.[20]

The words of the Vedas abound in mysteries. They have been made immortal by the First Cause of all divine knowledge, who has bound them in symbols and allegories. They hint towards a divine knowledge that is spiritual in its nature, and cannot be comprehended through the normal usages and methodology of language. But as soon as, the Nirukta technique used by the ancient seers, is employed, the formulae of the Vedas open their doors for the competent scholar and reveal to him their real mysteries. As soon as this knowledge is obtained, one becomes conscious of a systematic body of knowledge contained in the vedic formulae. One then realizes that the Vedas are a text of divine knowledge that also reflects the highest philosophy. Western scholars have so far felt convinced that the Vedas are devoid of any kind of intellectual philosophy. But Maharishi Dayananda's stupendous efforts have revealed to us the real intellectual philosophy of the Vedas, a philosophy that is the original source of the Upanishads and the six vedic philosophies. And on the basis of which we can discover the real harmony existing among the Vedas, the Upanishads and the six vedic philosophies.

According to Dayananda, the Vedas propound a realistic philosophy. This can be called the theory of three eternals (त्रैतवाद), according to which Dayananda believes that God, Jiva or soul and Prakrati or matter are eternal entities. According to Dayananda, the **main subject of the Vedas is God,** but he rejects the view that the Vedas are polytheistic. Instead, he is convinced that they are monotheistic. Their monotheism is identical to the Brahmanism of the Upanishadic seers. The Vedas enfold within themselves the basic concepts concerning God, soul, nature, actions, the consequences of actions, rebirth, and the search for the highest salvation, which is man's greatest problem. Some scholars opine that the Vedas do not contain spiritual knowledge but, it is Dayananda's conviction that they contain both spiritual and material knowledge[21] and also that the highest objective of the Vedas is to promote consciousness of the omnipotent God. This makes them essentially spiritualistic.[22]

Polytheism -- Henotheism and Monotheism

The view that since the Vedas advocate the worship of numerous Gods, they must be considered polytheistic texts, has come down to the present day from medieval times. Western scholars in particular did much to give currency to this view. In direct opposition, Swami Dayananda believes that the Vedas reflect monotheism, that all the four Vedas express faith in the same Brahman whom they regard as supreme, that they direct that worship should be offered to this Brahman alone. He also states explicitly that no where do the Vedas direct that any other God should be worshipped.[23]

In the Vedas, the same Divine Spirit has been addressed by a variety of names such as Supreme Lord (देवानाम् देवः) Master of universe etc. Dayananda's argument is that such natural forces (देव) as air (वायु) sun (सूर्य) dawn (उषा) etc., and such spiritual forces as varuna, rudhra, etc., who find mention at various points in the Vedas are not separate gods with corporeal bodies in human or any other form, but only forces (देव) of convenience or practical utility. This latter phrase Dayananda uses merely to suggest that these are natural forces which influence our life, or some divine forces of the spiritual sphere which are related to the spiritual aspect of life. But in no circumstances are these forces the objects of worship. The sole object of worship is the one Brahman.[24]

Whether the Vedas propound polytheism or not is an issue, the determination of which depends upon our choice of technique for a commentary upon the Vedas. In other words, it depends upon our choice of the ancient Nirukta technique, or Sayana's ritualistic method, or the comparatively recently formulated naturalistic technique of western scholars. We have already analysed and established the fact that the ancient Nirukta technique is the only appropriate one, if we wish to discover the truth of the Vedas. Western scholars, as one could expect, interpreted the word 'deva' to mean God, in keeping with their technique. Consequently, with this interpretation at the root, A. A. Macdonell was able to discover a wonderfully mysterious town of Gods in the Vedas, in which the chariot of the God Surya is drawn by seven horses, in which the goddess Usha assumes the role sometimes of Surya's wife and at other times of his mother. He has gone so far as to establish that Usha is also the consort of all the gods.[25] Scholars of this class have tried to establish a parallel between Vedic divinities and gods and goddesses of Greek mythology so as to lend solidarity and strength to Vedic mythology and thus they have succeeded in creating a new topic of comparative mythology.

Henotheism:—Max Mueller, the renowned scholar managed to propagate an entirely different kind of polytheism, which he claims to have discovered in the Vedas. In his opinion, the Vedas specifically ordain the worship of thirty three gods, while he suggests that at one place a sage has counted as many as 3339 gods. However, he does rot categorize this galaxy of divinites as polytheism because to him the Vedic polytheism does not appear similar to the Roman and Greek polytheism. In the latter case, polytheism envisages the existence of numerous major and minor gods under the supervision and direction of one Superior or Supreme God. In Max Mueller's view, since there is no scope for one Supreme God, hence vedic polytheism differs from this in exactly the same way in which the collective democracy of villages differs from the autocracy of a king. He further argues that vedic sages worshipped each god or divinity as the supreme being, irrespective of his actual status. Consequently, he coined a new name for it, Kathenotheism, which means the worship of one god after another, or Henotheism, which means the worship of many distinct gods.[26] According to him every Vedic God is supreme in himself.

In Dayananda's interpretation, the Vedas do not bear evidence of either polytheism or henotheism. He points out to a basic error in the reasoning that supports such conclusions. In all the four Vedas, the word 'deva' occurs in many Vedic Mantras which scholars have translated as god. As a result of which it has become difficult to arrive at the true interpretation of the term, because as soon as 'deva' is understood to mean god, he becomes an object of worship. On the contrary, in the Vedas, 'deva' is not invariably an object of worship, and especially not so as long as it does not stand for the Supreme Being Brahman or Paramatma. It is Swami Dayananda's opinion that interpreting the word 'deva' to mean god in the Vedic context is a major blunder.[27] In this, the Swami is in complete agreement with Nirukta, because according to the latter, this term does not mean God. Instead, Nirukta points out that "देवो दानाद्वा दीपनाद्वा द्योतनाद्वा द्युस्थानो भवतीति वा"[28] (Nurakta 7·15) deva exists when one gives alms, deva is that one who illuminates, one who teaches i.e. teacher is also deva, parents are also devas because they bring up the children, deva is any heavenly body which exists in stellar system. According to Nirukta's explanation, all such materials can be regarded as deva which possess any one of the above mentioned qualities. In this way, the luminaries, such as the sun, fall into the category of deva because they benefit mankind, but this does not endow them either with corporeal bodies or the right to be objects of worship. Of course, since all these qualities are conjoined to the Supreme Being Paramatama, He can be regarded as the deva of all devas, and since he keeps within his influence all the deva of utility. such as surya, chandra. rudra, marut, etc, he can be considered as the highest deva or Mahadeva. Dayananda believes that there are two kinds of devas in the Vedas, the devas of utility or convenience, and those that are objects of worship. In his view, surya, chandra, rudra, etc., belong to the former category, without being worthy of worship. In fact some of them have material existence, while the rest are natural forces. Still others are manifestations of the various powers of the Supreme Being through which He directs the universe. The only object of worship in the Vedas is one Paramatma, though he may be addressed differently by various sages and seers. Thus, Dayananda concludes that the

Vedas ordain the worship of this Paramdeva or Paramatma alone, not of any other.[29] Whether the Vedas are essentially polytheistic or monotheistic is a subject on which Brahmana texts are certainly more authoritative than western vedic scholars, and we can see that the Shatpath Brahmana states quite distinctly that one who worships any God other than Paramatma is similar to an animal.[30] Consequently, it appears without doubt that Swami Dayananda is able to approximate very closely to vedic thought and spirit.

In the Vedas, very often the mention of such gods as Indra, Marut, Surya and others has been accompanied by all those adjectives which are applied most appropriately only to Paramatma. It appears that it is this fact which has raised in Max Mueller's mind the illusion of Henotheism. In contrast, the fact is that the seers who envisioned or realized the Vedas, use a variety of names to address the Supreme Being Paramatma who bestowed upon them the light of the Vedas, and that the names they use are his qualitative secondary names. Dayananda explains that wherever Indra or any other deva has been embellished with such adjectives as omnipotent, or other adjectives suitably applied only to the Supreme Being, one should interpret the name to be a symbol for Paramatma only, because this Supreme Being alone is omnipotent and the true object of worship. Going beyond this, Dayananda states that from the very beginning of creation, the Aryans used to understand the names Indra, Varun, Agni and others as being applicable to or symbolic of the Supreme Being, and it was the Supreme Being they worshipped. This is what is clearly established by the evidence in the Vedas. In order to end the confusion and to make it clear when the names of such devas as Indra are to be understood to mean Paramatma, Dayananda has propounded the criteria of context and adjective. According to this rule, wherever vedic formulae contain adjectives suggestive of worship, prayer, obeisance, omnipresence, purity, universality, the power of creation etc., the names of devas should be taken to imply the Supreme Being Paramatma, because all such qualities can exist in the Supreme Being.[31]

In this way, in order to explicate the monotheistic spirit, of the Vedas, which is their true basic spirit, Swami Dayananda has provided for us a guiding principle that "such names as Agni primarily indicate Paramatma or Parmeshwar."[32] He also says that

"wherever adjectives suggestive of worship, prayer, obeisance, omnipresence, purity, unversality, and power of creation occur, the names to which such adjectives are conjoined are to be understood to be references to Parameshwar.[33]

Whether the Vedas themselves support the contention of Swami Dayananda or not can be determined by objective thinkers on the basis of the following formulae (mantras) which clearly propound monotheism.

"Whatever sentient and non-sentient is in this creaton all is pervaded by the Supreme Lord."[34]

'The same Supreme Lord (being knowledge) is Agni (being the abode of all at the time of dissolution) is Aditya (being all powerful) is Vayu (being the source of happiness) is Chandrama, (being pure) is Shukra. (being greatest) is Brahaman (being omnipresent) is Apah and (being the Lord of all) is Prajapati."[35]

'We offer our prayers to that Supreme Lord who is the master of all creation conscious or non-conscious let that Lord protect us."[36]

Mantras of similiar content and intent are scattered broadcast through the four Vedas, and they establish beyond doubt that the vedic formulae clearly propound a monotheistic view.

But the reaction of such western scholars as Griswold and the many native scholars, who imitate western thought, to this view of Dayananda is one of instant rejection. They immediately categorise it as an unscientific and barbaric view.[37] Griswold's confusion and nonsensical statement are obviously due to his failure to understand the vedic language. It is symolic of his ignorance. Brahmana, the Upanishads and Nirukta, among other vedic texts provide a more than adequate elaboration of vedic terminology, and it is this method which Dayananda has adopted. Is it right, then, to dismiss his commentary as barbaric and unscientific ? Griswold's charge can best be answered in the terms of Sri Aurobindo who says that such a charge is entirely untenable, because the Vedas themselves state that we must keep in mind only one God who is addressed variously as Indra, Yama, Matarishwa and Agni.[38] Western scholars counter this argument by saying that all the vedic formulae suggestive of monotheism are later creations. Such a great, ennobling thought, which is possessed of enlightening clarity, probably arose later, in some inexplicable way, in the minds of later Aryans, or alter-

natively those ignorant, fire worshipping, sun worshipping and sky worshipping Aryans could have borrowed it from the aborigines of this land, the cultured, philosophic and grand Dravidians, who lived here before them. This conjecture on the part of western scholars is extremely wicked, and proof positive of scholarly dishonesty. They lacked even the simplest knowledge regarding the Vedas, and it can be said that in studying the Vedas, their main purpose was to undermine and devalue the prestige of the Vedas, which they were prepared to do at any cost.

As far as there is any question concerning the first objection raised by western vedic scholars, we have already shown in the preceding page: that vedic formulae supporting monotheism can be found at every place in the Vedas and that the following two formulae such as "तमीशानं जगतस्तथुषस्पतिं" Rg. 1.6.15.5 and "एकं सद्विप्रा बहुधावदन्ति" Rg. 1.165.46 belong to the first mandal of the Rigveda. Consequently, it is difficult to comprehend how western scholars could have advanced such a nonsensical argument. Their second contention, that the Aryans derived their monotheistic outlook from the Dravidians, is an entirely baseless and meaningless conjecture. In the first place, there is considerable doubt whether the Dravidians, inhabited India before the Aryans. Despite this, even if such a contention is accepted by argument of force, there is as yet not one jot of evidence proving that the Dravidians possessed highly sophisticated religious thoughts or philosophy because the coins discovered in the Sindhu Valley excavations bear a script which is yet to be deciphered. Hence, it is beyond rational thought to determine how the western scholars succeeded in relating the linguistically fixed and determined knowledge of Aryans to Dravidian knowledge, whose very existence is highly suspected. In fact, all such arguments are no more than flights of fancy encouraged by western scholars. They want to superimpose their prejudices upon the Vedas. It is because of this that they discover polytheism, henotheism and mythology in the Vedas, almost at will.

It is clear from the preceding description that the Vedas are monotheistic and that their monotheism is similar to the concept of Brahman of the Upanishads, and also that Dayananda's views on the Vedas are more logical and rational than those of either Sayana or western scholars.

BRAHMAN

The Vedas contain a superfluity of mantras or formulae which expound the idea of one Supreme Being who is the Master of the universe and the sole occupier of all the worlds (bhuvans).[39]

The description of this Supreme Being, who is variously referred to as the Supreme Being (parma-purusha), the Chief of creation (srashti ka adhyaksha), the God of gods (devon ka deva), and Brahman is found in numerous formulae.[40]

Most of the scholars on the Vedas — more specifically modern scholars of the western mould assume that the Vedas do not contain knowledge of God, and that the concept of Brahman evolved after the Vedas, in the Vedanta, that is, the Upanishads.[41]

However, Dayananda is not in agreement with this view because his basic assumption is that the main purpose of the Vedas is to help realization of God or Parameshwara and to propound and propagate such knowledge.[42] He states that every sentence of the Vedas breathes the very essence of Brahman, either directly or through tradition.[43] In support of this view, Dayananda draws evidence from the Upanishads which themselves state that the Vedas contain a description of Brahman. The Kathopanishada says that "that which all the Vedas sing is Om."[44] As if this is not enough, the Vedanta system of philosophy, which fundamentally elaborates the knowledge of Brahman, also says that " in the Vedas is found a description of Brahman."[45]

The Nature of Brahman in the Vedas — the Vedas cannot be satisfied with the conception of any Supreme Being which can either be equalled or outdone by any other divine entity. In them, Brahman has been referred to as omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient. Other such adjectives are also conjoined to Him. He is the Highest Being of creation, who raises the structure of creation in the beginning of time (Kalap). During the period of creation, He raises and supports, while in the period of destruction, he destroys all existents and absorbs them within Himself. It is the power of this Supreme Being which is responsible for ensuring that the sun and similar objects continue to perform their functions.

Whenever any one entity is recognised as omnipotent or allpowerful, it is necessary to assume also that it is both formless and omnipresent. The Vedas allegorically and symbolically express the omnipresence and formlessness of Paramatma, saying that "you are undoubtedly possessed of innumerable faces which enable you to see everything in every direction, you are inherent everywhere."[46] His might (mahima) is so immense that this entire universe is as nothing when compared to the (mahima) might of this Supreme Being. In fact it appears that the whole creation, in its entirety, exists in only one quarter of His expanse, while the remaining three are void of creation (amritmaya),"[47] where there are no worlds. The Brahman does not have specific parts because He is omnipresent, because He inheres in everything. But it is a Vedic practice that profound secrets and mysteries are expressed through symbols and allegories. Those seers who had envisaged the great truths of the Vedas adopted this technique for expression because of the inadequacy of ordinary language for describing the Supreme Being or Supreme Element. The Vedas express the universality or omnipresence of Brahman in a separate formula, saying that Brahman is in addition to even these four parts (padas), He is infinite.[48]

According to Maharisha Dayananda, all the four Vedas ordain that this incomparable Paramatma must be worshipped. From beginning to end, the Vedas are filled with the worship of this one Brahman. The Atharva-Veda says that "He, for whom the sun, the very personification of light, is like a skin, He who is capable of eradicating the sufferings caused by divinities such as Agni and others, He is the sustainer of the universe, and worthy of worship. He is worthy of being served? May he shower happiness upon us."[49] The seekers of salvation worship this Supreme Being so that they may be able to cross this ocean-like universe and escape pain and death. The Vedas declare with certitude "that one can escape death only by possessing knowledge of the refulgent otherwise there is no means of escaping death and its bondage."[50] It now becomes clear from the preceding brief account that there is not the least exaggeration in Dayananda's statement that the Vedas are texts of Brahmanic knowledge and that the knowledge of Brahman expounded in the Upanishads has its source in the Vedas.

CREATION OF THE UNIVERSE

The Vedas contain many curious and mysterious statements concerning the creation of the universe. The formulae of the Vedas themselves raise the question: what is the astounding basis of this universe ? What is its first cause ? From where did come the material of which it is constructed ? What is the nature of it, out of which, Jagadishwar who after creating such heavenly-bodies as the earth and the sun, showers them with his blessings and covers them with his glory ?[51] But such curious statements in the Vedas should not drive one to the conclusion that the seers to whom the Vedas were revealed were in a state of doubt regarding the creation of the universe, or that they were ignorant of its creator and material cause. It is characteristic of Vedic language that questions precede answers. The immediately succeeding mantra or formula answers these questions. "One who sees everywhere, one who is known everywhere, one who is all-powerful, one who is all-pervading, that unique Supreme Lord creates the earth and other celastial bodies from atoms, and by his infinite might controls the whole universe."[52]

Dayananda's view is that the Vedas accept Paramatma as the creator of the universe, the being whose glory and power are infinite.[53] At certain places, the Vedas attain to a clarity comparable to that of the Upanishads and explicitly accept Paramatma as the Chief of creation. Paramatma is inherent in the universe and also beyond and outside it, or, in other words, this entire creation is as nothing before this Supreme Being. The Vedas state that this universe, which has the appearance of being infinite, is situated in only a part of Brahman, while the other three parts are void of creation.[54] But the glory of this Paramatma is not limited only to these four parts or aspects, but is in fact infinitely more extensive than this.[55] Such formulae indicate that the Vedas do not consider creation to be infinite. Instead, they regard Paramatma as infinite because he is inherent in the universe. This Vedic viewpoint does not suffer from the defects of western Deism because according to the Vedic concept, God does not first create the world and then depart. Instead, He remains inherent in the universe, and being infinite, He continues to exist even outside and beyond it. According to western Deism, God creates this universe out of nothing, and having completed

the task of creation, He departs. In the context of the Vedas, Dayananda is unable to accept both these views, because, in the first place, it is illogical and irrational to assume the creation of the universe out of nothing. Firstly, he regards this as being nothing more than a flight of fancy. Secondly, the departure of God after completing the task of creation implies that God is neither infinite nor omnipresent. And any entity which is not omnipresent, cannot possibly be omniscient. It is not appropriate to use the term God for a being who is neither omnipresent nor omniscient. Apart from this, some scholars argue that the Vedas are expressive of Pantheism, which states that God is everything, in other words, that God is creation and God is the creator.[56] Swami Dayananda rejects this view, too, with reference to the Vedas, because he contends that the Vedas regard Paramatma as a pure viewer or envisager and who is changeless (drashta and aparinami).[57] In that case, how can He convert himself to take the form of the universe ? Why should He wish to change himself, from knowledgeable to the ignorant, from the happy to the suffering, from the truthful to the false ? Paramatma is conscious while the universe is material and unconscious, Paramatma is omniscient while the universe is devoid of knowledge, Paramatma is joy, while the universe is joyless. In view of this, Paramatma cannot be the material cause (upadan) of creation.

God is the efficient (nimitta) cause of creation—Maharishi Dayananda is convinced that the Vedas believe God to be the efficient (nimitta) cause of creation. It is held that the Paramatma brings forth creation from nature lying in a nascent or latent state just as the potter makes earthen vessels from mud. One Vedic formula does go so far as to say that the two entities, that is, Brahman and jiva live together in friendship upon one tree, which symbolizes nature. One of them, the jiva suffers the results of actions while the second, Brahman or Paramatma does not participate in them but only enlightens them.[58] The seer to whom was revealed this particular formula indicates three infinite elements, fi st, Ishwar or Brahman who is the efficient (nimitta) cause of creation, second, the jivatma, for whose experience and indulgence this creation has come to exist, and third, nature or Prakrati, which, being the raw material of creation, is its material (upadan) cause. From this philosophic viewpoint, we can consider this nature as the basic matter or nature

in its nascent or latent form. This same nature has been referred to by the Sankhya philosophers as the unmanifested nature in which three elements of satva, rajas and tamas exist in harmony. Swami Dayananda refers to it as the capacity or power (samarthya) of Parameshwar.

In this way, it becomes evident that Swami Dayananda is able to place the Vedic texts on the foundation of realism by proving that they accept the existence of nature, a concept which, as we shall see later, comes into conflict with the theory propounded by Shankaracharya i.e. non-dualism. Though Shankaracharya may not have touched upon or even sought to interpret the Vedas, yet regarding the Upanishads, only that philosophic elaboration can be concidered valid which coincides with the Vedic text. The reason is that since the Upanishads themselves consider the Vedas to be self-proved, revealed and authoritative how can they turn against the very spirit of the Vedas? Apart from Swami Dayananda, the acceptance of the existence of an eternal and infinite nature in the Vedas is evident in the works of such scholars as Dr. Radhakrishnan,[59] but since it is expressed in a muted voice, it makes little or no contribution to the understanding of Vedic philosophy.

Description of the emergence of creation (Nasadiya Sukta)--In my view, the Nasadiya Sukta provides the most elaborate and majestic account, though in a mysterious fashion, of the form that nature (Prakarti) had in a state of chaos (प्रलय) before becoming creation, the state it was in, the power that gave it direction when it changed from its nascent to its manifest form, and the various materials that came into existence in the process of creation. No other text can rival its description. This Sukta is so profound and authoritative that the scholars who do not proceed beyond the purely intellectual level find in it one mystery after another. Perhaps only a yogin can comprehend it in all its fullness. Describing the state of chaos, the Veda states—

(i) At that time, there was neither untruth nor truth. Space, which is full of atoms, also did not exist. Neither was there the sky. At that time, what was covered, and on whom did it depend ? Was there very deep water at that moment ?[60]

(ii) Then, there was neither death nor life, neither day nor night. He alone (Paramatma) was existing in the glory of His power, and He was breathing (with nature without life breath, and there was nothing beyond) or superior to Him.[61]

(iii) In the beginning everything was darkness, and covered with this darkness was the latent nature (Prakarti), and all this, in its unknowable state, was uniform like water. It was inferior to Paramatma. It started becoming one, or manifest, by the glorious power of Paramatma.[62]

(iv) (Love overcame in the beginning, which was the seed emenating from Manas. Seers searched in their minds and knew that there was brotherly relation between untruth and truth (latent and actual)[63]

(v) The rays of light of these three fell obliquely. Both above and below it, all was wonderful. There were those who were to assume the seed of life; they were powerful and glorious (the jiva). On one side was the soul's power of assumption and beyond it was the power of effort.[64]

(vi) In fact, who knows and who can really say where this infinitely varied creation came from and where it started ? Even the deva (seers and luminous or refulgent bodies like the sun, etc.), also came to exist later on. Now, who can know from where this creation emerged ?[65]

(vii) He, who created this manifold universe, also sustains it. If He does not (whole of the creation will vanish, here the word 'va' is used in positive mood). (Paramatma) its Master, who exists in deep infinite space; O Jiva know Him. If do not know (you will doom to destruction).[66]

(The meanings of these formulae have generally been derived from Swami Dayananda's texts, but where they were not available, they have been obtained from the texts of other scholars. Swamiji's commentary is available only upon the formula 1 — 2— 3 and 7.)

Commenting upon and elaborating the first of the forementioned formulae, Dayananda writes that in this state of chaos, the Asat or visible world did not exist (the practical world is referred to as false because of its inherent changeability.) Even the real, that is, unmanifested nature, did not exist, and it was a condition in which even atoms did not exist. Here, it is natural to voice the doubt that, since in that state, the unmanifested nature of satva, rajas and tamas, did not exist, how is it possible

to treat nature (Prakrati) as without beginning and infinite ? Such a question is justified. In answer to this, Swami Dayananda argues that nature, assuming a very subtle form, existed in the capability of Paramatma.[67] By suggesting that nature was blended with the capability of Parmatma, Dayananda does not imply its absence. Instead, he implies that it existed in an extremely subtle form, a state which was perhaps even more subtle than the notion of Pradhan, given by Sankhya thinkers. In the state of chaos, nature (Prakarti) became very subtle and continued to exist in the capability of Paramatma. In the third mantra, the words "apre-ketamsalilam" have been interpreted by many scholars as very deep, profound water, whose depths are shrouded in darkness. From this they have concluded that in the beginning, nature (Prakarti) existed in the form of an indistinct ocean which was shrouded in darkness.[68] However, in the beginning of this formula, it has already been stated that the latent nature had become covered (vyapt) through darkness (tama). Consequently, the words "apreketam salilam" have been used merely to compare nature with indistinct deep waters, which refutes the view of these scholars that in the beginning, nature existed as a deep, indistinct ocean. Further,how could death exist in this first (praka) state of nature ? Since, the sun, moon and stars did not exist, night and day, too, did not exist. Through the desire (ikshana)[69] and power (tap) of Paramatma, the asat or imperceptible nature began to progress towards a state of truth or manifestation. The initial, or pre-natal stage, of nature was so profoundly indistinct that even seers have nothing definite to say about it. Neither is it possible to base any calculation upon such luminous bodies as the sun, the moon and the stars, since all such celestial bodies came into existence at a much later stage of creation. The seventh formula has been interpreted some what as follows by some Indian and Western commentators. 'The Lord of creation, Paramatma, accepts and assumes it or not whether he even knows it or not.' Dayananda, however, discounts the possibility of any such doubt in this formula because in all the preceding formulae it has been declared that Paramatma existed prior to creation, and that the task of creation was initiated through his determination and power (tapa). If this is assumed, is it conceivable that Paramatma was unaware of the point at which the process of

creation had its beginning ? Even the average intellect can comprehend the argument that he who has brought creation into existence must know the order and progression of it. Consequently, in this context, Dayananda's commentary appears to us to be the most rational. In addition, the sentence has been elaborated by Dayananda thus: "The God has brought into creation this universe of infinite variety is the creator, destroyer and even possessor of this universe. My dear friends! it is only that individual who realises Paramatma through his intellect, is able to achieve union with Him, while he who does not know Him remains steeped in misery."[70] In this formula, Dayananda interprets the word 'va' at both places to have a specific, meaning in positive sense, whereas western commentators see it as indicative of doubt or uncertainty.[71]

Description of Creation in the Purusha Sukta— In addition to the Nasadiya Sukta, a detailed account of creation is also to be found in the Purusha Sukta of the Yajurveda. This Sukta informs us that the Paramatma created this universe out of twenty-one kinds of material, and also that He created seven parameters (paridhi) around each loka or planet.[72] Having created the sun, moon, earth, etc. and other materials, Paramatma then separately created the bodies of various living creatures according to their class, for example, man, horse, cow, etc. He also created the various kinds of foodgrains, water, etc., both on the earth and in space, and He further created the various creatures living in forests and rural areas.

In this way, the preceding accounts give the impression that knowledge concerning the origin of creation is found in a very scientific form in the Vedas. In addition to such direct accounts, other descriptions concealed in allegories and metaphors can also be found. Dayananda had no difficulty in giving such descriptions a scientific form by giving all these accounts a yogic interpretation.

REBIRTH KARMA AND THE FRUITS OF KARMAS

It is perfectly clear from all that has been said so far that in Dayananda's view, the Vedas declare the Jivatma or the soul to be different from Paramatma, and also eternal. Once the fact of the soul being eternal is accepted, one is compelled to accept as a corollary both rebirth and the theory of karma

which logically flows from it.

The teleological view is that creation has a purpose. According to the Vedas, God did not create the universe without any purpose. In Dayananda's view, the purpose of creation is to provide for the Jiva the world of experience and path of salvation. This means that God has created the universe so that the Jivatma gets the fruits of his evil as well as good actions and achieve his salvation. Before achieving salvation, the Jiva takes birth again and again in this world in order to suffer the fruits of his previous actions.

Rebirth — Many scholars refute the view that the Vedas propound the theory of rebirth. In this connection, Dr. Radhakrishnan declared that the Vedic Aryans were too deeply pre-occupied with the present life to have any intrinsic interest in the thought of another birth after death. He also opines that the Vedic Aryans had no specific theory or principle about rebirth. However, he concedes that they did think about a life after death, but they conceived of it as being located in either heaven or hell. Dr. Radhakrishnan thus means that the Aryans believed that the jiva went either to heaven or hell after death, where Yama reigns.[73] Such a comment makes one feel that perhaps Dr. Radhakrishnan is completely dependent upon western Vedic scholars for his views on the Vedas. In direct contrast, Maharishi Dayananda fully accepts the fact of a principle of rebirth in the Vedas. In his commentary upon the formulae which contain this view, he says "O dispenser of contentment, Parameshwar, please bless us with the highest sight and others ense organs, and life which consists of mind, intellect, consciousness, ego, power, glory, etc., when giving us rebirth.[74] This formula contains a direct reference to rebirth. And, such formulae abound in the four Vedas, the one referred to above is not an exception. The Yajurveda says :'पुनर्मनः पुनरायुर्म आगन् पुनः प्राणः पुनरात्मा म आगन् पुनश्चक्षुः पुनः श्रोत्रं म आगन'।[75] Which can be rendered thus : "O Parameshwar, as many times as we are born, may we be blessed with a pure mind, a complete life, freedom from illness, pran, a soul possessed of ability, penetrating vision and powerful senses." In the same way, the Atharvaveda also says, 'पुनर्मैत्विन्द्रियं पुनरात्मा द्रविणं ब्राह्मणं च'।[76] This

can be translated thus: "O God, may we, with your blessings and kindness, in our rebirth, obtain all the eleven senses including mind, an able soul capable of assuming pran, wealth and the knowledge of the Vedas."

These foregoing formulae make it evident that the doctrine of rebirth had its origins in the Vedas themselves, and that there is no substance in the views of western Vedic scholars and their modern Indian disciples when they claim that the Vedas do not contain the doctrine of rebirth, and that this doctrine evolved later on in the Upanishadic and Darshan texts. Our view is that the doctrine of rebirth as exemplified in the Upanishads, had its origin in the Vedas. In propagating this view, Swami Dayananda appears far more logical and in consonance with the real Vedic philosophy than other Vedic scholars who hold a contrary opinion.

Karma and the fruits of Karma——In addition to the principle of rebirth, the Vedas also contain the doctrine of Karma and the fruits of Karma. The truth of the matter is that the doctrines of Karma and Rebirth are inextricably bound to each other. The kind of actions a jiva indulges in during his present life time determine the kind of birth and life he is to get in the succeeding life. Good actions lead to a good rebirth while evil actions bring punishment in the form of rebirth at a lower level of life.

Some scholars have attached a fantastic interpretation to the Vedic principle of Karma. They argue that this Karma and the fruit of Karma is limited strictly to yagnas or rituals and heaven or hell is experienced as a result of either performing or failing to perform such yagnas. They thus interpret the Vedic principle of Karma in terms of ritualism because their own philosophy lacks any principle of rebirth which can make possible the suffering of the fruits of one's action.

On the other hand, Dayananda has elaborated upon the Vedic theory of Karma in an entirely scientific manner that is consistent with the expression given to it in the Upanishads and other texts.

आयो धर्माणि प्रथमः ससाद ततो वपूंषि कृणुषे पुरूणि ।
धास्युर्योनिं प्रथम आविवेशा यो वाचमनुदितांचिकेत ॥

(Atharva-Veda 5. 1. 2)

In his commentary on the formula quoted above, Dayananda writes that the individual, whose actions in previous life are

in keeping with dharma (not to be interpreted strictly as religion), obtains, as the fruit of such actions, many superior kinds of corporal bodies whereas the non-virtuous person is punished with inferior bodies. The jiva or soul which is capable of suffering the fruits of its virtues aud sins in the preceding life, relinquishes the body and subsists in air. It then enters first water, medicine and vital pran, and then it enters semen from where it finds its way into the uterus, and thus ensures for itself a rebirth.[77]

Two paths — Pitrayana and Davayana — Dayananda explains that the Vedas point out two paths of action or conduct for the the living being—Pitrayana and Devayana. According to him, the former path is that which, when followed by the living being, allows him to assume a corporal body as a result of the union between mother and father. He then continues to bear the fruits of his previous sins and virtues. In this manner, he returns to this world and takes rebirth many times. The latter path, Devyana, is the path by which the jiva obtains salvation and is thus freed from this cycle of birth and death becausc he is freed from the bonds of his actions.[78] Here we find that the Vedic theory propounds the view that the fruits of one's actions are to be suffered in this or in subsequent lives, but we also find that it propounds a path which, when followed, leads one to salvation and freedom from rebirth, a path which is completely dissociated from vice or virtue. This view is further clarified in the Yajurveda, where it is said that 'one should wish for a life of hundred years in which one may indulge in actions, but these actions should not be such as to become a bondage for the person.'[79] This implies that the Vedas ordain action without desire as the path to salvation. Thus, the theory of Nishkama Karma propagated in the Gita is also found to have its roots in the Vedas.

MOKSHA

The Vedas abound in reference to yagnas or rituals, and it is ordained that rituals should be performed for securing wealth, respect, family and other sources of pleasure and contentment. This has led to the profound misunderstanding among many modern Vedic scholars, that the objective of the Vedic man was to obtain a simple and trouble-free life on this earth, and subsequently a

life of limitless pleasures in the company of the Gods in heaven.[80] Consequently, they insist that the Vedic Aryans performed these rituals with a view to obtaining entrance to heaven, so that they may be able to join their ancestors there and thenceforth lead a life of unstinted sensual pleasures made possible by the possession of a beautiful body. They further argue that since the Vedas define two kinds of deeds, sins and virtues, these deeds can also have only two consequences, hell and heaven. Concerning the conception of salvation, in which the living soul escapes from the cycle of birth and death and becomes immortal, thus escaping forever from the clutches of pleasure, pain, virtue, sin, action, sacrifice, etc., they opine that it emerged much later, in the Upanishads, even after the Brahmanas.

In this context, too Maharishi Dayananda presents us with a novel viewpoint which is entirely original in the present period. It is a view that is capable of inspiring a revolution in the field of Vedic scholarship seeking to interpret Vedic religion and philosophy. Dayananda is in full agreement with the view that the Vedas insist on the possession of all kinds of pleasures and comforts through the performance of rituals and good actions, because such things are essential for a superior life and a civilized society. However, the Vedas do not say that attainment of wor ldly progress and conforts are final gains of the life. Rising above all such considerations, the Veda also speaks of and idolizes that divine state, which can be obtained only by enjoying the comforts and pleasures (which one has obtained through rightful action) in a spirit of resignation and renunciation. Dayananda's view is unquestionably fully borne out by innumerable formulae scattered through the Vedas. In these, the Vedas ordain that Brahman can be obtained. 'I worship the Vedas the pious mother of the seers, I pray for long life, children, animals, respect, wealth and finally knowledge of Brahman. So that I may achieve salvation.[81]

We have already stated that Dayananda looks upon the Vedas as primarily texts containing the knowledge of Brahman or divine knowledge, which means that in his opinion, the

main purpose of the Vedas is to lead man to salvation and ultimately attainment of Brahman. And, this also appears to be logical and rational because man's highest objective is to achieve this highest end, because he was brought into this world for this purpose alone. In view of this, if the Vedas, which were given to man for the purpose of enlightement and knowledge, do not elaborate the art of obtaining man's highest ideal, it would be wrong to consider them as a form of divine knowledge. This view about the Vedas continued down to the period of the Upanishads, but once this period ended, this view, that the Vedas primarily lighten up the path to salvation and attainment of Brahman, also suffered eclipse. Dayananda rectified this error, which had continued down through the centuries, and declared that according to the Vedas, man has no higher achievement than attainment of Brahman. He also declared that the four Vedas specifically aim at directing man towards such an attainment.[82] Our view is that the Vedas are full of knowledge required for attainment of God and the most profound mental or spiritual sciences. This knowledge is abundant in the Vedas. The need is merely to understand it. The twentieth century seer and Mahayogi Sri Aurobindo is in complete agreement with Dayananda on this point. He writes that a study of the Vedas demonstrates explicitly that the Rigveda, in its entirety, constantly circles around this profound subject — man's corporeal and mental preparation, the achievement of Truth and Good, and the perfect achievement of divinity and immortality in one self through evolution.[83]

Knowledge and Action as the means to salvation—The Vedas declare knowledge to be the prime means to salvation, while the Upanishadic principle that knowledge enables one to destroy all binding complexes is found in identical form in the Vedas. Propounding the path of knowledge defined by the Vedas, Swami Dayananda writes in his commentary upon one Vedic formula 'that the individual who is simultaneously aware of both knowledge and ignorance, he by following the path of action, conquers the death and by knowledge attains liberation "[83]

It is obvious from the preceding commentary that Dayananda gives equal importance to the path of action, along with the path of knowledge. In fact, the absence of action deprives knowledge of much of its prestige and leaves it imperfect. It is only through both knowledge and action that man really worships God, and thereby enables himself to destroy all his corporeal and emotional complexes, and thus finally reaches salvation. The Yajurveda, in the words of its enlightened seer, provides an impressive description of the path of salvation when it says, that "I believe in only that person as Parameshwar and an object of worship who is the most powerful, who enlightens all, who is completely free and distinct from ignorance, darkness or the defects of ignorance. Without knowing Him no man can be really knowledgeable, because it is only through knowing that Parmatma one can obtain freedom from the sufferings of life and birth, which are like an ocean, and thus reach salvation, which is of the nature of the highest and purest joy. There is no other way by which the bliss of salvation is to be obtained."[84]

This description also shows us that the Vedic concept of salvation is identical to the Upanishadic concept. The Vedas accept attainment of Brahman as the highest state. The Veda says that "this is the highest place of Vishnu, which is readily and uninterrupedly apparent to knowing persons who have obtained salvation."[85] Those scholars who seek to propagate the view that the Vedas believe only in heaven and hell can now perceive how false their notions are. We thus find that Dayananda is able, on the basis of his profound study of the Vedas, to propound that salvation or mukti as man's highest ideal is integral to the Vedas.

RETURN FORM SALVATION

In addition to this, Dayananda introduces us to a new idea concerning salvation, and that is, return from salvation to reincarnation. It is his opinion that, according to the Vedas, the jiva or soul does not obtain salvation for an infinite period, but that when the period of salvation is over, the jiva re-enters the cycle of birth and death. In support of this, Dayananda adduces the arguement that every action, which has a

beginning, it must also have an end. In support of this, Dayananda offers for consideration two formulae from the Rigveda. The Veda, in its question, demands to know "whose name should be treated as pure. Who is that indestructible power or entity, which exists at the heart of all material things, which always sheds light, which once again brings us to this world and allows us to meet our mother and father, after we have once experienced the happiness of salvation?"[86] The very next formula provides the answer in its statement, "We must recognize the name of this infinite, eternal, free, enlightened Parmatma as pure, because it is He who, after giving us experience of the happiness of salvation, once again gives us birth through the relations of mother and father, and allows us to meet them."[87]

After obtaining salvation, the soul returns to this world after a fairly long period of indeterminable length. This view is Dayananda's original contribution to the world of philosophy. He opines that this view has found expression in the Upanishads and Darshan texts. This question will be considered in detail when we enter into a discussion of the nature of salvation.

2

Dayananda and Upanishad

VEDA, BRAHMANA AND UPANISHAE

The symbolical and allegorical language of the Vedas is something of a puzzle in itself, while the many allegories found in it are full of innumerable equally mysterious instructions which serve to entice the seekers of Vedic knowledge in various ways. In consequence, these scholars aiming at revealing the secrets of the Vedas are misguided. The scholars who are able to resist the enticements of the richly allegorical and authoritative Vedic language are able to discover the infinitely invaluable treasure, of Vedic knowledge.

Knowledge of Sanskrit alone is not sufficient for comprehending Vedic language. The common mind is completely incapable even of coming close to the real truth. If one is to discover the eternal knowledge of the Vedas, two things are entirely essential — (1) knowledge of the Vedic form of Sanskrit, and (2) attaiment of the state of samadhi or profound meditation. All later seers and sages used these two devices to break down the granite wall of language and allegory in their search for Vedic truths. This monumental effort has become manifest for us in two forms— first, the Brahmana texts, and second, the Upanishad texts. Both of these bodies of literature elaborate the two main subjects of the Vedas, Karma or Action and Jyan or Knowledge.

Brahmana Texts—In the Brahmana texts is discoverable a systematic elaboration of the spiritual as well as worldly implications of Vedic ritualism. These texts are elaboration of the Vedas (the Samhita part). Maharishi Dayananda does not consider them as a part of the Vedas since these are creations of sages whereas the Vedas are a body of knowledge revealed

by God.[1] In the Brahmanas, the symbols of Vedic formulae have been placed and explained. For instance, in the Shatpath Brahmana the symbol 'ईषेत्वोर्जेत्वेति' has been employed for 'ईषेत्वोर्जेत्वा' for the purpose of elaboration. In the Aitreya Brahmana, the Rigvedic formula has been explained through the symbol 'अभित्वादेव. सवितरिति'. However, in these volumes the sages have tried to explain Vedic symbolism through a new symbolism, and though it is purposively an attempt to explain the secret meanings of the Vedas, it, in fact, proved even more difficult and complicated for later scholars than the mystic nature of the Vedas themselves. One consequence of this was that the western scholars completely ignored the spiritual explanation of yagnas and rituals given in these texts, and concentrated upon the material implications which were visible through the new symbolism. Thus, these texts came to be considered as descriptive exclusively of rituals, whereas, in fact, as we can see, they also contain a notable philosophical element.

Upanishadic texts — In the Upanishads, the seers turned their attention to knowledge or the path of knowledge. They realized and visualized the secrets of the spiritual formulae found in the Vedas through their meditation and spiritual powers and experiences. They provided a spiritual explanation of Vedic symbols. Since the sages responsible for the composition of the Upanishads did not pay much attention to language, the language of these texts is simpler than that of either the Vedas or the Brahmana texts. Instead of language, they placed the entire emphasis upon knowledge and identified Brahman as their direct objective, which is also the prime purpose of the Vedas. Consequently the Upanishads contain a detailed commentary on Brahman or God.

The Brahmana and the Upanishads are texts created by sages after the samhitas of the Vedas. They are not a part of the Vedas, as is the belief of some scholars. Maharishi Dayananda also does not consider them a part of the Vedas.[2] This certainly does not mean that Dayananda does not accept them as authentic, but he does distinguish between them and the Vedas inasmuch as the latter are self-evident (स्वत: प्रमाण), whereas the

former, being the statements of seers, are externally authenticated. (परतः प्रमाण)[3]

Do the Upanishads constitute a revolt against the Vedas? Some scholars hold and propagate the view that the Upanishads contain a revolt against the Vedas. The Vedas are texts dominated by ritualism, whereas the Upanishads are dominated by knowledge. These scholars opine that not only was the ritualistic and yagna-oriented technique of the Vedas sneered upon in the Upanishads, it was also categorized as useless and even mischievous.[4] In addition, they further contend that the Upanishads treat the Vedas as texts of materialistic knowledge while they believe the Vedas to be lacking in spiritual knowledge, or knowledge of Brahman.[5]

Swami Dayananda has no sympathy at all for such views. Concerning the conflict between the Vedas on the one hand ard the Brahmanic and Upanishadic texts on the other, a conflict which is the creation of fanciful scholars alone, Maharishi Dayananda's views differ from those of other scholars primarily on the point that he neither regards the Vedas as books concerning ritualism and yagnas alone, nor does he consider correct the principle of salvation through performing the rituals only, describ. bed in them. It has already been said earlier that the Vedas provide knowledge of both action and knowledge and that the subsequent Brahmanic and Upanishadic texts siezed upon one each and made it their main subject. The Brahmanas set about elaborating the subject of action while the Upanishads focussed upon knowledge. Indian scholars who imitated Sayana, as well as western scholars with a similar bent have demonstrated an inner conflict between the Vedas and the Upanishads. But their views are due to a failure to comprehend suitably the true subject of the Vedas. Besides, they also failed completely to comprehend the feelings of respect and adoration which Upanishadic seers had for the Vedas.

But the question that surfaces here is that while both knowlege and action are subjects of the Vedas, and that the Vedas regard knowledge as superior to ritualism, a view upheld by Dayananda also, the Upanishads have chosen to sneer at the Vedas by saying that "the boat of yagnas or rituals is heavier."[6]

Why is this so ? Besides, why have the Vedas been recounted as texts of worldly kuowledge ? In order to answer these questions and to resolve the difficulty, it is our opinion that attention should be directed to those formulae of the Upanishads which have given rise to these false notions in the first place. It has been said in Mundakopanishad 1—2—7 that "Undoubtedly, these yagnas, which assume the form of boats (which have been designated as the means for getting moksha) in which are seated sixteen priests (ritvikas), the host and host's wife, these eighteen irrational individuals who conduct the yagnas, feel pleasure by regarding these yagnas as virtuous and creditable, but these individuals are cast unto life and death time after time."[7] This formula clearly refutes the view of those who regard yagnas or rituals as means to salvation, a view that has been elaborated in the three preceding formulae (1—2—4, 1—2—5, and 1—2—6) by the sage who has composed this Upanishad. In this formula, the sage has clearly decried the view that salvation can be obtained through performance of rituals alone. In fact, of course, the Upanishads do not stand for a rejection of rituals or religious performances. They only oppose the view that salvation can be obtained solely through such rituals (agnihotra). Clear evidence of this view is available to us in the (1—2—1, 1—2—2 and 1—2—3) formulae of the Mundakopanishad in which the sage has spoken of ritualistic deeds as being suplements to or sources of inspiration for truly virtuous deeds.

If, we can now argue, the sage had considered ritualistic deeds as entirely unworthy, what need was there for him to describe them in this context ? In addition, the other Upanishads also admit the utility of ritualistic deeds involving the lighting of a sacred fire. In the Kathopanishad, Nachiketa had demanded of Yama the Vedic ritual of performing a sacrificial fire as a second boon, and Yama had elaborated and commented upon it for the sake of Nachiketa. If Vedic rituals are entirely unacceptable to the Upanishads, then it is reasonable to ask why Yama failed to reject them as contemptible. When we reflect upon the reality hidden in this controversy, our entire problem is resolved by reflecting the formula of the Ishopanishad. The formula says "Continue to do deeds and live up to the age of a hundred years but do such deeds which they are not able to involve, grapple or colour your spiritual entity."[8]

This formula (मन्त्र) ordains that one should live a life upto hundred years and remain engaged in actions but be free of desire. Any action indulged in with a desire for reward or benefit invariably becomes a cause of bondage, even if such an action takes the form of performing Vedic rituals. The Upanishadic refutation of ritualism as a means to the achievement of Brahman, infact, means a refutation of yagnas or rituals performed with some definite desire or objective. Swami Dayananda accepts the view that the Upanishads ordain rituals which are inspired without any desire. In his elaboration of one Upanishadic formula, he says that "those who possess a child-like intelligence and constantly wander about in ignorance and believe that they are blessed, a fact which indulging in rituals can neither understand nor elaborate for others, and such people, because of their anxiety remain surrounded by sufferings in the form of life and death."[9] We should now also consider what the Vedas have to say about the achievement of salvation through yagnas or rituals, The Vedas agree with the Upanishads on the question of indulging in rituals with a specific desire and achievement of heaven through rituals. The Vedas say that "how can that person benefit from the formula (ऋचा) of Veda when he does not know Brahman ?"[10] The Vedas make it explicit that one cannot hope for salvation merely by reading the Vedas. The sole path to salvation, say the Vedas, lives in the achievement or realization of Brahman. The Rigveda says unambiguously, "freedom from death can be obtained only through knowledge of Brahman, there is no other way to escape death."[11] In other words, the Vedas ordain that one can win freedom from death only by obtaining real knowledge, and never before this, no matter how many rituals one may perform. These statements make it clear that the Vedas and the Upanishads do not have difference of opinion concerning the validity, utlity or conception of rituals or yagnas.

Having considered this, we will turn our attention to the other question, whether the Upanishads consider the Vedas to be texts of materialistic knowledge. There is no doubt that the formula of the Mundakopanishad (1—1—5) 'तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्व वेदः' apparently declares the four Vedas to be texts of

materialistic or worldly knowledge. But, as is well known, the real subject matter and intention of any text cannot be rightly gauged from one or two isolated statements contained in it. For this purpose, we should focus our consideration on the fundamental sentiment of the text. Another formula from the same Upanishad declares the Vedas to be the knowledge of Brahman,[12] while yet another formula from the same text declares the Vedas to be born of Brahman.[13] Now, while the sage, who composed the Mundakopanishad, clearly believes the Vedas' to have originated from the Brahman Himself, it is difficult to understand how can he also simultaneously categorize them as volumes of worldly knowledge. The fact of the matter is that both worldly and spiritual knowledge lie concealed in the Vedas. But the majority of people in this world is concerned more intimately with worldly knowledge. While on the other hand, the language of the Vedas is such as to give rise to the apparent impression in the common mind of being concerned with materialistic knowledge. In consequence, these two factors combine to impress the common mind with the view that the Vedas are imbued with materialistic knowledge. In this context, when the sage declares the Vedas to be texts of materialistic knowledge, all that he means is that ordinary individuals see no more than this in the Vedas, but the spiritual knowledge is also found in the Vedas. It is that which leads to the realization of Brahman.

In contradiction to this, the opponents,—the western scholars—advance the argument that such an interpretation of the above-mentioned Upanishadic formula amounts to hair-splitting and deliberate distortion of evident meaning. Hence they contend that the Vedas do not contain divine knowledge, and also that the Upanishadic view of the Vedas as texts of materialistic knowledge is the correct one. In answer to this objection, Swami Dayananda advances another forceful argument. He says that "If the Vedas had really been lacking in divine knowledge, the sages of the Upanishads could not have had knowledge of it,"[14] Dayananda's argument is entirely convincing because divine knowledge is undoubtedly very subtle knowledge, whereas the form in which it is found in the Upanishads is highly developed. Hence, to assume that the sages who composed the Upanishads were able to create it in the absence of any existing body of

knowledge, is entirely illogical. If we look at the question from the evolutionary view, then we must ask that since a sapling cannot sprout in the absence of a seed, how was it possible for the detailed, explicit and refined divine knowledge of the Upanishads to come into existence without some nascent divine knowledge? On this subject, Sri Aurobindo's statement fully bears out Swami Dayananda's views, since the former says, that "the profound and climactic thoughts, as well as the mode of spiritual knowledge evolved after a detailed and stupendous effort, apparent from the Upanishads, could not have emerged from a preceding vacuum."[15] For such knowledge to have evolved, it is necessary to presuppose a pre-existing basis which provided the Upanishadic sages with both inspiration and subject matter for thought. And, the Vedas that we possess provide just such an adequate basis.

Whether the Vedas contain divine or Brahmanic knowledge or not is a question which we will now consider in the light of the other Upanishads also. The Kathopanishad says that "that which all the Vedas sing of, that which is the object of worship of all yogins, that for the realization of which one obeys the discipline of Bramcharya, that object (pada), I put it briefly, is Brahman."[16] It is clear that the Kathopanishad very explicitly declares the Vedas to be concerned exclusively with the elaboration of Brahman. Hence, it is difficult for us to understand how the Vedas can be considered as texts of purely materialistic knowledge. In this context, Maharishi Dayananda's viewpoint, that the Vedas contain both empirical (अपरा) and Brahmanic (परा) knowledge, but that their main purpose is to elaborate upon the latter, appears far more cogent and rational.[17]

Dayananda's rational analysis of the Upanishads compels us to accept that the entity, which the Vedas variously describe as the Master of creation, the God of gods, and Brahman, is no different from the divine being whom the Upanishads refer to as Brahman. The Upanishads also variously refer to this divine being as the soul of all, the eternal of all eternals, etc. The scholarly essays of such scholars as Dr. P. K. Acharya also appear to be profoundly influenced by Dayananda's view, because they say "that the philosophers of later ages did not see in the

Upanishads the end of the Vedas, but instead the highest purpose and objective of the Vedas."[18]

DAYANANDA AND THE PHILOSOPHY OF UPANISHADS

The great Vedic scholars, Shankar, Ramanuja, Madhva, etc., based their philosophic thought upon the Upanishads, and also wrote bulky commentaries upon the major Upanishads. Many scholars who did not compose commentaries also founded their systems of thought upon these volumes. One specific mode of operation discoverable in the works of scholars of Vedic philosophy is that they either compose commentaries on the Upanishads or use them as the basis and source of validation for their views. Though the philosophical tenets of these scholars manifest wide differences, but each one of them declares his own principles to be the true principles of the Upanishads. According to Shankar-acharya, the Upanishads propound the philosophy of Advaitavada, while Ramanuja is of the view that they contain Vishashtadvaita. Madva sees Dvaitvada implicit in these volumes. It is obvious that there must be some definite reason for such widely varying interpretations of the same texts. Objective cogitation makes it evident that the Upanishads contain numerous formulae (shruti) which enlighten the reader about many different philosophies. While one formula (shruti) clearly propounds Advaitism, another shows a clear bias in favour of Dvaitavada. Some of them also favour the Vishishtadvaita of Ramanuja. Perhaps, it was because of this that Max Mueller perceived the Upanishads to be lacking in any coherent and explicit system of thought.[19] He thus formed the view that the Upanishads were composed during different periods by different sages, and consequently the differences of opinion should be no cause for surprise.

Apparently, of course, Mueller's view seems to be a forceful and logical one, but a little deep thought quickly reveals a major weakness inherent in it. According to Swami Dayananda, the spiritual knowledge elaborated in the Upanishads is not the product of the normal processes of cogitation, but a body of knowledge realized by sages in a state of samadhi or trance after profound scholarship and intellectual determination. The Upanishadic statement 'अयमात्मा ब्रह्म'[20] which means that "He that is inherent in me is the omnipresent Brahman," contains a fact

which cannot be stated with the same clarity, determination and fearlessness in any mental state not approximating that of divine trance. Only the seer of the Upanishad could state it on the basis of his intimate contact with and realization of Brahman.[21] The Upanishads do not invariably accept as true any knowledge which is at the rational level or is merely heard, and so they explicitly state that "this soul cannot be realized through scholarship or study, neither can it be known through the reason or through hearing from others."[22] Concerning the right path to true knowledge, the Upanishads point out for us the path of hearing from the teacher (श्रवण), rational thinking (मनन) and meditation (निदिध्यासन). First, one should listen with complete faith and sympathy to the sages who have directly realized the truth. Second, one should then intellectually think upon this knowledge received through the ears. Finally one should turn to meditation (निदिध्यासन). In this process, the first stage is that of receiving knowledge through the senses, the second, which is subtler than the first, that of rational thinking upon the heard knowledge. However, the Upanishads do not limit the obtaining of knowledge and the validification of it to merely this. Instead, they declare that the final stage is that of realization of the subject in a state of trance-like meditation or samadhi, which is far subtler than any state which the mind can arrive at. This state of trance-like meditation is one of internal knowledge beyond the limits of mental perception in which the recepient comes into direct and intimate contact with the subject. This is a spiritual experience in which the soul of the seer establishes direct contact with the highest truth. It is a state in which speech comes to an end, and even the powers of the mind fail completely.[23]

It is now clear from the preceding analysis that the knowledge of the Supreme Entity described in the Upanishads is based not on the normal thought processes but upon the extremely subtle stage of meditation (समाधि). In it there is dircet relationship between the knower (ज्ञाता) and the nature of the object (ज्ञेय). In consequence, the know ledge then obtained is free from doubt or error. **Hence, it is wrong to seek for mutual contradictions within the Upanishads.**

This brings us back once again to the same question, if all the Upanishads are unanimous on the nature of eternal truth,

then why do they contain mutually contradictory formulae (shruti)? Besides, why do different acharyas or sages seek to establish different systems of thought through them? It is true that all the commentators declare that their different theories are founded in the Upanishads, but no commentator accepts the view that there is any contradiction within the eleven major Upanishads. Accordi rg to Acharya Shankar, all the major Upanishads propound the philosophy of Advaitism, while according to Madva all of them propagate the Dualistic theory. The fact is that the apparantly contradictory revelations (shruti) of the Upanishads do not, infact, contain any real contradiction. Rather, all of them describe different aspects or facets of the same truth. For instance, according to Shankaracharya, the revelation which propound dualism in fact differentiate between the practical (vyavaharika) and the transcendental (paramarthika), while those which advocate Advaitism are expressive of Brahman who is without attributes. It appears that western scholars have formed a habit of seeking for contradictions in these texts. Not merely this, wherever they do discover such inconsistency, it occasions them great pleasure.[24] But texts which have been composed by sages can be successfully understood only by a mind attuned by yoga, a quality which such scholars have always lacked.

Do the Upanishads contain Shankara's Advaitism ?—Swami Shankaracharya was the propagator of Advaitism, and in his view, the Upanishadic texts propound exactly this system of thought. In his opinion, the Upanishads have declared one Brahman alone as true, a Brahman who defies description because He is without attributes. Apart from Brahman there is no element which is infinite and eternal. It is Brahman who through His maya (power of creation) brings into existence the varieties of creation. On the subject of maya, Shankaracharya says that it is neither of the nature of truth nor non-truth, because lacking an existence like Brahman, it is not true, but because it is not false like a sky-flower, therefore, it is also not false. In his opinion maya is indeterminable from the point of view of truth or falsity, and hence nothing can be said about it. Through maya Brahman manifests Himself in many forms.[25] Infact, Brahman does not have any transformation because He is

without form and impurity, and hence there can be no transformation in it. Acharya Shankara is the proponent of perversion theory (vivartavada), according to which the cause appears as the effect without shedding its original form or nature. This universe is the perversion (vivarata) of Brahman, or, in other words, according to Shankara, one perceives the universe in Brahman, but this does not have any effect on Brahman, just as the clay transforms into many pots but still remains unchanged in nature.[26] A little thought reveals that according to Shankaracharya, the existence of the universe in the Upanishads is not true existence, but the equivalent of the false existence of dreams in sleep.

On the other hand, we can also discover in the Upanishads certain shrutis which accept the truth of the universe as well as its cause.[27] The mayavada of Shankaracharya, particularly in the form in which he has described it, is nowhere directly discernible in the Upanishads. It is because of this that Shri Ramanujacharya was able to subject this philosophy of mayavada in his works to logical and rational criticism, and to declare that the mayavada attributed to Vedic literature by Shankar was entirely illogical. He declares that the true philosophy of the Upanishads is Vishishtadvaita.

Maharishi Dayananda has his own opinion about the philosophy of the Upanishads, which differs from the views of these philosophers. He declares, that the Upanishads believe in three eternal (traitvada) because, according to his interpretation, these texts accept Brahman, jiva and prakrati as the three eternal elements. It is also his contention that the Upanishads nowhere reflect or even make mention of the mayavada propounded by Shankara. He admits that the word 'maya' has occured in the Upanishadic texts occasionally, but wherever it has occured, the meaning attributable to it differs from the meaning thrust on it by Shankara. Shvetashvetaropanishad declares "know the Maya as Matter"[28], which means that here the word maya has been used to represent matter or prakrati, which has three attributes. The Upanishads do not describe the false existence of the universe and neither do they consider it as the mirage or perversion (vivarta) of Brahman.

On the contrary, the Upanishads make frequent mention of parinamvad i.e. transformation theory. In keeping with this realistic viewpoint discoverable in the Upanishads, the Sankhya philosophy declares that matter (Pradhan) is the material cause of creation, and holds that this is in consonance with texts.[29] The manner in which the process of creation has been described in the Upanishads is purely realistic. Any sage who believes the universe to be false, or similar to the reality of dreams, or a mirage, cannot provide such a realistic description of the creative process. The Upanishads do not declare prakrati and jiva to be false or deceptions; it has of course been stated in them that Brahman is the Eternal of eternals,[30] which implies that Brahman is master of eternal elements like jiva and prakrati. Dr. Radhakrishnan is of the view that the realistic elements obtained in the Upanishads received further reinforcement in the Sankhya philosophy, which was propounded later.[31] It is clear, therefore, that the Upanishads, far from being idealistic (mayavadi), are realistic.

Although Swami Dayananda did not compose any commentary on the Upanishads, but the realistic (traitvadi) viewpoint evolved by him is clearly seen in the Upanishadic formulae quoted and elaborated by him in his various works. He frequently quotes and refers to Upanishadic formulae in support of his views.

It now becomes clear from the preceding analysis that Swami Dayananda's realistic philosophy of three eternals (traitvada) possesses its own force and consistency. In addition, we are also able to discover that his viewpoint is not an entirely novel one, which could, on that account, be considered an aberration or a wilful one, because it is a view that was held by earlier sages also, though in a little different forms. Whether the Upanishads are really amenable to the interpretation put upon them by Dayananda in establishing his traitvad is a subject which shall be analysed in the succeeding paragraphs.

DAYANANDA'S TRAITVADA-BRAHMAN, JIVATMA AND PRAKRATI IN THE UPANISHADS

Criticism of Shankara's view in Upanishads— Swami Dayananda is the propounder of traitvada as discoverable in the

Upanishads. In his opinion elevan major Upanishads provide a description of the eternal nature of Brahman, jiva and prakrati. In the Upanishadas Brahman has been described as 'एकमेवद्वितीयम्' i.e. non-compared to second. The Advaita philosophers interpiet this sentence in nondualistic method and declare that Brahman is unique, which means that the only entity which exists is Brahman, there is nothing else. In his commentary on this sentence, Shankaracharya has commented that though the potter can be seen as the efficient cause which turns clay into pots and other earthen vessels, the shruti quoted above refutes the contention derived from the preceding illustration that there is some other cause, different from truth, which helps Him in the process of creation. This refutation is established by the use of the word "adviteeya," which means incomparable or unique. Thus, the shruti means that there is no entity apart from truth or Brahman.[32]

Swami Dayananda rejects Shankara's interpretation of this statement. In his opinion, the function of an adjective is not merely to differentiate but also to publish, propagate and direct. He goes on to explain that in its differentiating function (vyaavartaka), the adjective 'adviteeya' or unique points to the difference between Brahman and the other two elements, jiva and prakrati, and thus establishes Brahman as unique. But, in its propagative function, it arouses consciousness of the fact of Brahman being one.[33] But, he further comments, the Upanishads, by declaring Brahman to be one, never intended to convey that there is no other entity apart from Brahman. It is admitted that no other entity possesses the power and capabilities of Brahman, and that there is nothing above Brahman. But this sentence does not simultaneously deny the existence of jiva and prakrati apart from Brahman. The fundamental difference between Swami Dayananda and Shankara at this point is that the former takes the word 'unique' as being indicative of Brahman's supremacy and omnipotence, while Shankara uses it to establish his Advaita philosophy, which declares Brahman to be the sole entity, and refutes the existence of any other entity. In this elaboration, Swami Dayananda agrees with Sri Ramanuja and Madhva. Dayananda explains that the word "advaita" is an adjective for Parameshwar, just as the races of human beings and other living beings are composed of numerous discrete

entities, such is not the case with Paramatma. In every way, He is only one.[34] The implication is that in Dayananda's view, Parmeshwar has been referred to as unique in the Upanishads because He is the Supreme Being and omnipotent, and not in the form of monism.

Brahman is the subtlest of all things. He is omnipresent like the sky. He lives in all materials as their souls. The Upanishad states with perfect clarity that 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' (Ch. Up.3. 14. 1), the Brahman is immanent in everything and everywhere. The Advaita thinkers interpret this to mean that this entire universe is Brahman Himself, and they often identify this statement with 'नेहनानास्ति किंचन' (Kath. Up. 2. 1. 11) They express this thus 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म नेहनानास्ति किंचन' which implies that everything is Brahman and that there is no manyness in Him, and one who sees manyness in Brahman is compelled to suffer life and death innumerable times.[35] With reference to these Upanishadic statements, Dayananda is of the view that the two statements 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' and 'नेहनानास्ति किंचन' belong to two separate Upanishads, and if they are interpreted separately in their respective context, the meaning attributable to them is completely different from the one attributed to them by Advaita thinkers. The two statements 'सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म' and 'तज्जलानिति शान्त उपासीत' go together which Dayananda interprets as an injunction that the jiva must worship that omnipresent Brahman who is the source of creation, existence and continuance of the universe.[36] The statement 'नेहनानास्ति किंचन' belongs to the Kathopanishad, and according to Swami Dayananda, what it means is that there is no conjunction of various objects in this conscious and indivisible Brahman. But here too the Kathopanishad, similar to the statement 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम' of the Chandogyopanishad, does not constitue a denial of the existence of other entities apart from the Brahman. Instead, it tells us that the indivisible Brahman is not a constitute of other entities or objects. Just as the purest gold is that which does not contain even an atom of any other metal. Brahman, too, is uniform or pure. The fact that the jiva and prakrati, in their individual forms, continue to exist in Him by his power, does not violate the purity of Brahman.[37] In this way, we see that Swami Dayananda is able to establish his theory

of Trinity (त्रैतवाद) vey successfully on the basis of these Upanishadic statements.

In the Upanishads, Brahman has been referred to as the Being who gives fruits, while the jivatma has been referred to as that which experiences. The Mundakopanishad states explicitly that two beautiful and active birds live on one tree, which is of the form of nature, and one of them tastes the fruits of the tree while other unconcerned with fruits provides them to other.[38] In his elaboration of this formula, Swamiji declares that of this jiva and Brahman, the one who is jiva fully experiences the fruit of virtues and vices in this world, which is compared to a tree, while the other, Brahman does not experience the results of karma, but instead remains luminously everywhere, both within and without.[39] In the succeeding formula, the Mundak-Upanishad says even more clearly that the experiencing jivatma lives on the tree i. e. prakrati completely involved in it, and because of parkrati's power of concealment, it becomes enamoured. When the yogin, on acquiring purity, is able to perceive God as being distinct from himself, and observes the majestic grandeur of that power, he becomes free from sorrow.[40] In all these formulae it is clearly perceptible that the Upanishad clearly states that Brahman is the power who provides the jiva the fruits of his vices and virtues, while the jiva, being distinct from Brahman, is the experiencer who experiences prakrati in its assumed form of the tree. Sri Dwijendranath Shastri is of the opinion that the Upanishads provide a description of the jiva who experiences, prakrati which is the object of experience, and Brahman who rules over everything. He further opines that Brahman is eternal, omnipotent, and the creator, sustainer and destroyer of creation. The jiva, is possessed of limited powers, it is small like atom, free in his actions but dependent upon Brahman for the fruits of his actions. Prakrati is unconscious, dependent, the material cause of the universe, eternal and undergoing change (परिणामी),[41] (The Shastri's views appear to be profoundly influenced by Swami Dayananda).

In addition, we also see that the advaita philosophers speak of those formulae which propound the dualistic principles as pertaining to world of experience, not to transcendental reality (paramartha) because in their opinion there is non-dualism in the latter. At this point, it is reasonable for us to ask the Advaita philosophers to show where the Upanishads point out

the elemental difference between the two entit ies, transcendental (paramarthic) and phenomenal (vyavaharika). Do the Upanishads not provide an account of the creation of the universe ? If they do so, then is it justifiable to treat the world as a false entity similar to dreams ? In that case, is there any basis to make a distinction between parmarthic and vyavaharic formulae ? It is interesting to note that at the worldly or vyavaharic level, even the Advaita thinkers accept the concept of three eternals (त्रैतवाद), and this acceptance of differentiation at this level only provides a very powerful basis for Swami Dayananda's concept of three eternals. We can, therefore, claim that the Upanishads contain formulae supporting his philosophy. If such formulae had not formed a part of the Upanishads, there would have been no reason for the Advaita thinkers to conceive of a phenomenal world (व्यावहारिक सत्ता). The vivid and realistic description of creation found in the Upanishads leaves no possible reason for anyone to posit the existence of illusion in it. [42]

Brahman is the creator of the universe—According to Swami Dayananda Brahman has been called the creator of the universe in the Upanishads. All entities originate from Him, after birth they continue their existence in Him, and when the time for destruction comes, they lose their existence and return to the core of Brahman to exist in an unmanifested form.[43] Swami Dayananda accepts that the Brahman described in the Upanishads is the efficient (nimitta) cause of creation, which implies that Brahman makes use of prakrati (which, before creation, existed in a latent or unmanifested from) to create the universe in various ways. The Taitriya-Upanishad also supports this contention by declaring that in the begining the world was non-existent. Out of non-existence it came into existence which means that it existed in an unmanifested form before coming into being. Later on, Brahman converted this unmanifested existent into a manifest one.[44] Here the sage of Upanishad emphasizes the point that it is Brahman who is the creator of the universe. But this never implies that Brahman is both efficient as well as material cause (अभिन्ननिमित्तोपादान कारण) of creation, which is what the Advaita thinkers believe. Instead, He is the only efficient (nimitta) cause of the universe. In the Upanishads, it is prakrati which is accepted as the material (upadan) cause of creation.

Creation is not a perversion of Brahman—Swami Dayananda accepts the philosophy of transformation (parinamvada), and believes that the Upanishads also contribute to the same view. If it is accepted that the Upanishads support transformation (parinama) theory instead of perversion (vivarta), it become logically necessary to accept that along with Brahman, prakrati too, is an eternal entity. Swami Dayananda does not accept that the eternal, pure, intelligent and free Brahman comes under transformation (parinami), because such an assumption would distort His true nature. According to transformation theory, the qualities, actions and nature of the material (upadan) cause transfer themselves to the effect. Swamiji is of the view that the world is inert and so its material cause must also be inert. Prakrati alone can, therefore, be considered as the material cause. In his commentary upon the formula of Shvetashvetara-Upanishad Swami Dayananda explains that it is a statement of the Upanishad that prakrati, jiva and Brahman, all three, are unborn, which means that they are never born. They never take birth. This means that these three entities are the causes of the universe. They themselves are not dependent upon any preceding cause. The eternal jiva continues to experience the eternal prakrati and thus becomes enmeshed and bound, but the eternal and infinite Brahman neither experiences prakrati nor becomes enmeshed in it.[45]

The realistic viewpoint of the Upanishads does not possess any novelty, and neither can it be said to be opposed to the true spirit of the Upanishads. The dualism of the Sankhya philosophy is also believed to be implicit in the Upanishads. Sankhya advocated that the Matter (pradhana) is composed of three gunas. The Upanishads definitely possessed formulae which declare the Prakrati or matter (pradhana) to be possessed of three gunas, such as the statement says that "one unborn is composed of red (rakta), black (shyama) and white (shveta)."[46] These three elements can be taken to be referring to Raj, Tamas and Satva respectively. The succeeding formula further states that this pradhan creates a world attractive, and beautiful. Shankya philosophy also accepts that prakrati is unborn and eternal.[47] The Sankhya principle of causation i.e. satkaryavada is also found in the Upanishads. In explaining the emergence of the effect from the cause, the Chandogya-Upanishad states that 'O Shveta Keto ! Know (realise)

thou water as the cause of the earth (पृथिवी) in the form of food (anna), fire (तेज) as the cause of water and from the effect fire know the real, matter or Prakrati as the cause. This real matter or Prakrati is the cause of whole creation. And all of the creation was extistent in its unmanifested form in Prakrati before coming into being.[48] The process of the emergence of the effect from the cause, as depicted in this formula, gives the impression that the Sankhya concept of transformation (satkarya) is based exclusively on this formula. In addition to this, one can find scattered in the Upanishads a large number of formulae which support the Sankya contention. At another point, the hvetashvetra Upanishad says that, "Just as the spider weaves its web and then hides itself behind the web, in the same way the Deva has concealed himself behind threads, which are of the nature of pradhana."[49] It becomes perfectly clear from the presceding elaboration that the Upanishads contain a multiplicity of formulae which explicate that Prakrati—which the Sankhya thinkers later on came to refer to as the pradhana—is as eternal and infinite as Brahman. This same prakrati lives in the womb of the Brahman in an unmanifested form during the period of dissolution, but it does not ever cease to exist.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN BRAHMAN AND JIVA IN THE UPANISHADS

Dayananda believes in the concept of three eternals, and according to his view that Brahman, jiva and prakrati, all three, are eternal and infinite substances.[50] This principle can, in the terms of philosophy, be referred to as Traitvad. As has already been explained at length, the Swamiji's interpretation of Upanishadic formulae is guided by his concept of the three eternals, and consequently he is convinced that in the Upanishads Brahman and jiva are regarded as distinct entities. Formulae which support this view can be found in great numbers scattered throughout the Upanishadic texts. The jiva who acts, is compelled to suffer the results of its actions, while it is the Paramatma which gives the fruits to the jiva. The jiva indulges in actions and bears their fruits according to its acts in the governance of Brahman. But the Brahman does not become involved in actions or their fruits because he is self-sufficient and there is nothing left for Him to do. The Mundakopanishad states that "On a single tree (which is of the form of prakrati), there are

seated two birds (of the form of jiva and Brahman), and of these two, one of them, the jiva eats the fruits of that tree, implying that it tastes the fruits of prakrati, while the other, that is, Brahman, does not consume the fruits but merely witnesses the jiva doing so."[51] This formula of the Upanishad establishes explicitly the difference between and the distinct existence of Paramatma and jiva.

This view, propounded by Swami Dayananda, is opposed to the non-dualistic or Advaita view which propounds the principle of Maya. In his commentary on the Upanishads, Shanakaracharya repeatedly emphasizes the oneness of Brahman and jiva, and in his view, the jiva is only a reflection of Brahman which becomes involved in ignorance or Maya. In Shankara's view ignorance and Maya is essentially one and the same. But the exponents of Maya have yet to delineate its nature. In their view, Maya is a mysterious power or principle which is capable of engulfing Brahman with ignorance. Swami Dayananda is of the view that Shankara's principle of Maya suffers precisely from this major shortcoming, the view that Maya is able to influence Brahman and engulf Him in ignorance, while Brahman who is pure intellect, free, omnipotent, etc., forgets His real nature and gets involved in such qualities as finitude, the experiencer and agent of virtuous and evil deeds, limited, etc. In brief, what this means is that Brahman is deprived of His real nature. In our view, too, the Upanishad does not support the principle of Maya and the relationship of oneness between jiva and Brahman. In contrast, of course, one does find numerous formulae which state that Brahman continuously exists in his nature of perfect peace, goodness and uniqueness.[52] Here uniqueness does not mean non-dualism.

Apart from the foregoing points, even if we examine the Upanishads with other means, we cannot find any validation for the non-duality or identity of jiva and Brahman. The Upanishads ordain that Brahman must be worshipped, which means that Brahman can be achieved only through worship, and not through any other means. But if Brahman and jiva are accepted as identical, it is difficult to understand who will worship whom. Does it imply that Brahman will worship Brahman himself? Without accepting the duality between Brahman and jiva, it is impossible to conceive of any relationship between a

worshipper and the object of worship. The Upanishads declare Brahman as the highest object of worship, which the jiva must attain. This clearly establishes the distinct existence of the jiva and Brahman.

Further, at many places in the Upanishads there is a description of the state achieved by those sages who are able to achieve proximity with Brahman through penance and meditation. In the state of meditation (samadhi), the yogin has before him only one purpose, because for him the idea of world and himself cease to exist.[53] This state of meditation is so profound that in it the yogi has before him only knowledge. But an even deeper state of meditation is that of deep samadhi (asampragyata) in which the seer becomes so completely immersed in Brahman that he completely forgets himself, and thus reaches a condition in which, according to the Upanishadic expression, "who is to see whom ?" and thus the seer is constrained to exclaim that "I am Brahman." Apparently, such Upanishadic expressions seem to support the advaita or non-dualistic view, but here also those who support the view of three eternals (traitvadi) interpret them to mean that the jiva and Brahman are distinct. Their contention is that all the Upanishads declare without doubt or ambiguity that on achieving the knowlege of Brahman, the enlightened one wins freedom from all doubts, actions, and miseries, he becomes capable of achieving his goals through his will alone, there is nothing left for him to know, he becomes exalted and perfect. But this does not mean that he becomes Brahman. The reason is that Paramatma is the Supreme Brahman, "and one who knows Him becomes like Him." (यो परमं ब्रह्म वेद ब्रह्मैव भवति । मु०उ० 3.2.9) This statement implies that he who achieves knowledge of the Param-Brahman Paramatma, becomes Brahman, which means that he becomes great. To say nothing of this, the Upanishad proceeds a step further in its elucidation of this when it says that "when the enlightened one visualizes Paramatma, who is creator, pure light, Supreme Being, and who is the first source of knowledge, then that enlightened one, sheds the bonds of vice and virtue, becomes pure and reaches the supreme identity of Brahman."[54] This formula further clarifies that even in the state of salvation, the jiva does not become absolutely identical with Brahman, instead it arrives at the state of supreme identity with God. Dayananda explains that when the jiva is able to

partake of such attributes of Brahman as bliss, he then appears to be like Brahman, just as an iron ball immersed in fire assumes the attributes of fire and thus appears like fire.

Besides, the neo-vedantists i. e. Shankar and his followers, interpret the statement 'अहम् ब्रह्मास्मि', which occurs in the Brahadaranyaka Upanishad,[55] to mean that "I am Brahman." On this basis, they seek to establish that the jiva is Brahman. Dayananda interprets this statement differently because he says that it is a figurative expression, similar to such a statement as "the mountains cry out." But mountains being lifeless, do not have the power to call out and hence such a statement may mean that some persons seated on the mountains call out. The forementioned statement is also susceptible to a similar interpretation. But the Vedantists may object to this by arguing that since all objects exist in Brahman (Brahmastha), no purpose is served by reiterating that the jiva also exists in Brahman. No special meaning can thus be deduced from the statement. Swami Dayananda admits that it is true, that all objects exist in Brahman, but he explains that the similiarity or intimacy that the jiva possesses with respect to Brahman, is far more than that which any other entity possesses, and so the jiva is nearest to Brahman. In salvation, the jiva has knowledge of Brahman, and exists in direct relationship with Him. It is only that jiva who exists in such a state, can say that he is Brahman (अहम् ब्रह्मास्मि) that is, he exists in Brahman. Dayananda further argues that this does not imply the oneness of jiva and Brahman. He says that just as any individual can say of another that the latter and he are same and inseparable, in the same manner, the enlightened jiva, in a state of deep meditation, fully soaked in love of Brahman, declares that he is Brahman (अहम् ब्रह्मास्मि), meaning that he is established in Brahman in supreme identity. Only that jiva who is able to adapt his qualities, actions and nature to those of Brahman can be conscious of proximity with Brahman and declare his identity with Him.[56] It is readily apparent from this that in the Swamiji's views, the knowledge of the Upanishads has been gathered by enlightened seers at moments of direct experiences in a state of profound meditation. In o [illegible] and profound meaning of the Upanishads can be comprehended only in a similar state. Like this, Mandukyopanishad also contains a statement '*Ayamatma Brahman*'

(Ma. U.2.). Here Swamiji does not interpret the word '*Aymatma*' to mean jivatma, which is what the Advaita philosophers do. Instead, it is his conviction that the word has been used for Brahman consciousness i. e. Brahmatma. He then goes on to elaborate by saying that "when the enlightened yogi directly perceives Brahman in the state of deep meditation, he can say that He that is inherent in me is the Brahman who is omnipresent."[57] In this explanation, Swamiji means to say that when the yogi is able to realize Brahman directly in his meditative state, then, in that state, he can say that the Atman which he perceives then is Brahman. (The word 'soul' according to the statement 'योऽतति व्याप्नोति स आत्मा' refers to Brahman. In the Upanishads, this word Atman is frequently used to represent Brahman). The Neo - Vedantists or the Advaita philosophers take another Upanishadic statement 'thou art that' ('तत्त्वमसि' Cha. Pra, 6 kh. 8 M. 7) and explains that "jiva is Brahman," and they on this basis establish the identity of Brahman and jiva. Here, Dayananda asks such philosophers how they can interpret the existence of Brahman from the word 'tata'. His own interpretation of this word is different. The full formula is "स य एषोऽणिमैतदात्म्यमिदं सर्वं तत्सत्यं स आत्मा तत्त्वमसि श्वेतकेतो इति।" (Ch. U. 6. 8. 7) It means: "He that is supremely subtle and the Soul of the entire universe and the jiva, He alone is True and the Soul of Himself. O Shvetketo! Dear son, you are conjoined or related to that omnipresent Paramatma."[58] In this way Dayananda relies upon this formula, too, to establish the distinction between Brahman and jiva, instead of proving their identity or oneness.

In the Upanishads, the dimension of the jivatma has been considered atomic, while that of Paramatma as infinite (vibhu). In its description of the jivatma, the Shvetashvetaropanished has this to say, "divide the front end of a hair into a hundred parts, then take one and again divide it into another hundred parts. The smallest part thus obtained represents the soul."[59] What this amounts to is that the nature or dimension of the jivatma is similar to that of an atom. But the dimension of Brahman has been invariably stated as being infinite in the Upanishads.

In the Upanishads, the distinction between Brahman and jiva is found at a number of other places also. The Brahman is extremely subtle because of which He can inhere in all things.

Since He is far more subtle than even the jiva, He can pervade the jiva as He does other entities. The jivatma is able to perceive the Brahman pervading itself only through worship, penance and profound meditation. In the Brahadaranyaka-Upanishad, there occurs a dialogue in which Yagyavalakya declares, "That Parameshwar which exists in the jiva but is different from the jiva, of which the ignorant jiva is unaware, that Paramatma for which the jiva is the body, which lives inside the jiva and guides the jiva, is also the infinite being which pervades you, or your soul.[60]" In this formula, Brahman is stated to be pervading the jiva but being distinct from it. Shri Ramanujacharya believes that the relation between Brahman and jiva is that of the body and the soul inhabiting it, and it appears that his view is based on the Upanishadic formula explicated above. And if this formula is the right foundation for the views of Shri Ramanujacharya, then it is no less appropriate an explanation of Dayananda's distinction between Brahman and jiva. The sole difference between these two thinkers is that Ramanuja accepts qualitative distinction (svagata bheda) in Brahman whereas Swami Dayananda is not ready to accept any distinction in a uniform, indivisible Brahman.

It becomes apparent from the preceding analysis that according to Dayananda, Brahman and jiva are distinct from each other, but Brahman pervades the jiva. The jiva, having the dimensions of an atom, has its existence in the Brahman, which may also be expressed by saying that Brahman and jiva both exist in each other. Supporting this contention of Dayananda, the Upanishad states with perfect clarity that 'The (Being) which pervades the sun and that which exists in the right eye (jiva), exist in each other[61], Brahman being all pervading is present in the sun and jiva both, therefore, Brahman and jiva have been said to be. existing into each other. The seer of Kathopanishad says that "the yogin finds himself (jivatma) and the Brahman within the deep core of his heart as quite distinct like a shadow and the sun."[62] Meaning thereby, that to the yogin jivatma appears before Brahman like a shadow before the sun. Commenting on this formula Dayananda writes that the Upanishads advocate the distinction between Brahman and jiva by the formulae like 'गुहां प्रविष्टौ सुकृतस्य लोके', and such formulae lay scattered in the Upanishads.[63]

It is now clear from the preceding analysis and elaboration that the principle of three eternals (traitvad) propounded by Maharishi Dayananda—that Brahman, jiva and prakrati are all eternal--is firmly rooted in the Upanishads and can be directly discovered therein. It is, however, true to some extent that the Upanishads also contain a few statements which support non-dualism. But according to Swami Dayananda, these statements (shruti) are expressions made during the period of profound meditation in which the jiva, having assumed such attributes of God as bliss, exists in a state of identification with Him. On the other hand, the statements which support the view of division or differentiation, which support Dayananda's theory, are far more frequent and numerous. However, even those statements which express a non-dualistic approach do not really support the advaita system of thought. The real attitude of a text cannot be understood by extracting one or two isolated statements from it. For this purpose, the text must be seen in its entirety. When this is done, the tendency of the Upanishads seems clearly to be in support of the concept of traitvad, a tendency expressed not by one or two isolated formulae but the entire text. Dayananda says clearly that the Upanishads speak of Brahman as the eternal of eternals, which clearly implies that apart from Brahman, everything else is not finite, but instead that there are other infinite element also, over whom the Brahman rules. What entities belong to this category ? This is made clear by Mundak Upanishad which states, "there is one eternal prakrati which possesses the attributes of satva, raj and tam, which gives rise to many kinds of entities by giving them birth out of itself, there is one eternal jivatma which consumes and experiences the materials born of prakrati, and there is one eternal Paramatma which does not experience these experiential entities."[64] This is an explicit statement of the view that apart from Brahman, the jivatma and the prakrati are two other eternal entities also, and thus it fully validates Swami Dayananda's view of three eternals.

KNOWLEDGE, ACTION AND WORSHIP IN THE UPANISHADS

विद्यांचाऽविद्यां च यस्तद्वेदोभयं सह ।
अविद्यया मृत्युं तीर्त्वा विद्ययाऽमृतमश्नुते ।। Isopanishad 11 ।।

"The human individual who knows both knowledge and igno-

rance simultaneously, is able to achieve salvation through knowledge by overcoming death through karma-worship.[65]

Swami Dayananda propounds the view that according to Upanishadic texts, the achievement of Brahman requires the presence of three elements—Knowledge, Action and Worship. The Upanishads are the highest texts providing knowledge of life; so it is impossible to believe that they can ignore any aspect or life. Knowledge devoid of action and worship represents no more than intellectual skill, and for this the Upanishads say,"this soul is not to be obtained through an excess of study, nor can it be known through the intellect, and not even through listening to religious texts (shastras). Instead, it can be obtained only through the grace of Paramatma, since He reveals His real nature for the truly desirous."[66] Those enlightened seekers who worship God with true devotion do not find this impossible. In his elaboration of the foregoing formula, Swami Dayananda, lays great emphasis upon pure action, pure knowledge and pure worship as means to the realization of Brahman.[67]

Swami Shankaracharya rejects the path of karma for the seekers of salvation (mumukshu). He says that in the Upanishads," the opposition between knowledge and action is as immovable as a mountain,"[68] and then further states that,"according to this mantra ('ईशावास्यमिदं...'), there is a description of the path of knowledge through the complete renunciation of desires (aishnas), which is the prime meaning of the Vedas (Upanishads). Those who are ignorant and inspired by the desire to live find loyalty to knowledge impossible, and hence for them the path of action has been ordained through the formula ('कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि'...) This is the second meaning of Veda."[69] It is Shankaracharya's view that of these the path of renunciation is undoubtedly the most superior because the path of karma cannot lead to salvation (nishreyasya). He is of the opinion that Upanishad (shruti) declares that,"do not be greedy for life or death, go to the forest and then do not return."[70] It is the opinion of Shankara that through all these statements, the shruti ordains that renunciation is the best. But, as against this, Swami Dayananda interprets the formula ('कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि'—) to mean that, "Parameshwar ordains that man should, as long as he lives, even if he lives a hundred years, remain engaged in action, he should never sit idle."[71] But his actions should not be guided by the desire for

their fruits; instead, he should gain knowledge of reality and renounce the fruits of action. Such a renunciation is conceivable only in those actions which are inspired by knowledge, because only through knowledge can the agent be conscious that the fruit of action is unworthy and cause of bondage. Nowhere do the Upanishads suggest that karma or action should be abandoned; instead, it ordains that actions must be done. The Taitiriyopanishad elaborates five kinds of worship, concerning Worlds, concerning Fires, concerning the Knowledge, concerning Progeny, concerning Self, (अधिलोक, अधिज्योतिष, अधिविज्ञ, अधिप्रज्ञ तथा अध्यात्म), and it has been said therein that, "the wise man who gains knowledge of these five kinds of worships and makes systematic use of them, obtains every kind of pleasure and joy."[72] If the Upanishads had been opposed to action, they could have explicitly declared that actions should be avoided, and one should renounce the world to meditate in the forest. But, this is not the case. The Upanishads are not opposed to practical life. Accepting it as the reality of life, they do not reject or denounce participation in it. Yagyavalakya was himself a great Maharishi who had obtained enligtenment, but he led a normal family life. Dr. Radhakrishnan also accepts the view that the Upanishads do not favour renunciation of the world.[73]

In addition to action and knowledge as means to the realization of Brahman, the Upanishads also accept worship as a prime instrument. Knowledge can be obtained only through the intellect, but it is beyond the scope of the intellect to concentrate one's consciousness in Brahman. This does not become possible until the seeker surrenders himself completely before Brahman in a state of worship. There is a vide gulf between the skill of the intellect and the establishment of one's consciousness in Brahman. It is only when the consciousness is pure that it obtains the power to concentrate or meditate, and it is then that it gradually progresses towards higher purity. The pure conciousness alone has a right to spiritual knowledge. An impure mind misguides even the greatest scholars, just as a rogue horse takes its ridder off his path.[74] The intellect cannot penetrate deep into the sphere of knowledge of Brahman, and so intellectual skill alone is not sufficient fot realizing the Soul (God). The Kathopanishad says that, "This Soul is not obtained by eloquent teaching, neither by the intellect, nor by listening

much-"[75] The Upanishads point to the path of worship for the realization of heard (श्रुत) knowlege.

In these texts, one finds an extremely moving account of devout worship expressed in the most supremely touching words. The sage who has realized the Mundakopanishad ordains that the objective of Brahman should be sought with supreme concentration and dedication, saying, "use the OM as your bow, make the soul to be like an arrow, accept Brahman as the target, and then, abandoning laziness, shoot at the target, which is of the form of Brahman, with supreme concentration.[76] To say nothing of this, the devout seeker in the Shvetashvetaropanishad, prays to God and says, "O God, please absorb our intellect to your own form so that it may be able to obtain the knowledge."[77]

Concerning the combination of Knowledge, Action and Worship, the Upanishads are perfectly clear that this combination alone can be the source of the highest, and mysterious spirituality. In the Mundakopanishad, the majesty or grandeur of worship has been expressed in the following terms: "Those learned persons live in the forest, conduct themselves according to the mode of mendicants, and spend their time in the worship of Parmatma, with penance and reverence, find entrance of the path of the sun (path of pranas), and finally realize Brahman."[78] In the Prashanopanishad, Maharishi Piplada separately describes three kinds of worship in his fifth question, and says, "He that worships OM with Knowledge, Action and Worshipful heart achieves or realizes that Brahman in which there is no old age (jara), disquiet or death."[79]

It appears abundantly clear from the preceding account that the trine of Knowledge, Action and Worship enunciated by Maharishi Dayananda is the truest expression of the worship conceived in the Upanishads.

———

3

Dayananda and the Six Systems of Vedic Philosophy

SYNTHESIS OF THE SIX PHILOSOPHIC SYSTEMS

The process of knowledge initiated in the Upanishads was raised to a different level by the six systems of Philosophy. Upanishadic literature is a treasury of profound knowledge obtained by seers in a state of deep meditation (Samadhi). In these texts, the seers had no recourse to argument. Instead, the seers merely expressed their meditative experience in poetic language. The six Vedic philosophies, elaborate upon same knowledge obtained from the Upanishads. The seers who initiated these philosophies appear to have aimed at providing a sound logical and argumentative base for the metaphysics (tatva-gyana) of the Vedas. Such an attempt is observable in all these philosophical systems, but the Sankhya and Vedanta philosophies aim at this most directly and obviously.

The Vedic Philosophical systems are six in number—Nyaya, Samkhya, Vaisheshika, Yoga, Purva-Mimamsa and Uttar-Mimamsa. The last mentioned is also referred to as Vedanta philosophy or Brahma-Sutra. The originators of these six systems are as follows: Maharishi Gautam propounded the Nyaya philosophy, Maharishi Kanada the Vaisheshika, Maharishi Kapil the Sankhya, Patanjali Muni the Yoga philosophy, Gemini the Purva-Mimamsa and Maharishi Badarayana the Uttar Mimamsa. All these systems are considered orthodox (astika) philosophies. According to tradition, the systems which accept the authority of Vedas fall in the category of astika systems, while those which criticise the Vedas are considered heterodox (nastika).[1] Since all the six forementioned systems revere the Vedas as revealed, they are astika while the Buddhist, Jain and Charvaka Philosophies are classed as nastika because of their opposition to and contempt of the Vedas. All the six

systems — Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Sankhya, Yoga, Purva-Mimamsa and Uttar-Mimamsa — have been composed in the form of aphorisms, wherein the term aphorism or 'sutra' implies highly condensed and brief sentences in which the content is summarily expressed but nevertheless clearly explicated.[2] By means of the aphorisms the seer who propagates the philosophic system hints at or suggests the subject in a few words, the meaning of which can be interpreted and comprehended only after considerable thought and industry. Why have these philosophies been written in aphoristic form. The first reason appears to be that in the bsence of any system of printing, there was a tradition of orally memorising texts. In order to aid the memory and ensure protection against distortion, it was perhaps found most convenient to express thought in this form. Secondly, it becomes easy to understand and assimilate the brief statements containing profound philosophical mysteries because these aphorisms are capable of containing all the main thoughts on the subject.

On the other hand, however, this mode of expression has also been the cause of considerable harm. First, the real meanings of these texts have become excessively profound or even mysterious, with the result that interpretation has become difficult. Secondly, the aphorisms also do not clearly distinguish between the adversary's statement purva-paksha) and the statement of propounder (Sidhanta-paksha) so that it becomes difficult to establish context in between two successive statements. It is because of this inherent difficulty involved in condensed expression in aphoristic form that different commentators are able to arrive at completely different interpretations of the same aphorism occuring in the same text. While one commentator identifies a specific aphorism as belonging to the adversary, another commentator regards it as specifying the propounder's view. It is because of this complexity of the six systems of philosophy that many western and even Indian scholars were forced to conclude that they contained numerous inherent contradictions. For instance, there is contradiction between the atomism of Vaisheshika and the theory of three gunas of Sankhya, asatkaryavad is opposed to satkaryavad. Sankhya is an atheistic system. Mimamsa advocates only ritualism and Vedant propounds the doctrine of Maya etc. Such a point of view has been in existence since the middle ages. Sri

Shankaracharya has elaborately emphasised upon this contradiction in his commentary upon the Braham-Sutras, and this had profound repercussions both in India and abroad. Even Sri Ramanujacharya accepts that there is contradiction between the various Vedic systems of thought. It appears that Sri Ramanujacharya borrowed this view from his predecessor Sri Shankaracharya, because the aphorisms which the latter chose to illustrate these contradictions are also the same which Sri Ramanujacharya selected for the same purpose.

In the nineteenth century, Swami Dayananda provided these six systems with a new basis which differed completely from that which the traditional viewpoint had granted to them. **Swami Dayananda possesses the firm conviction that there is no inherent contradiction between these six systems.** He argues, instead, that each one of them elaborates the truth from different viewpoints.[3] The basis for Dayananda's conviction is that in the first place, all the six systems accept the Vedas as self-proved or authoritative, and hence they cannot go against the central viewpoint of the Vedas.[4] Secondly, they were propounded by seers whose viewpoint is explicit and free from doubt and confusion. He argues that the word 'seer' is rightly applied only to that individual who has obtained direct perception of his subject and who propagates the truth impartially, without any prejudice Swami Dayananda says that the six systems of Vedic philosophy, which are considered sub-parts of the Vedas, have been created by such seers.[5] Consequently, he clearly maintains that there is no contradiction between these six systems of Vedic philosophy. He is of the firm opinion that there is no contradiction between the atomism of Vaisheshikas and the theory of gunas of Sankhya, that the Sankhya Philosophy is theistic not atheistic, that the Vedanta philosophy is not non-dualistic since it specifically differentiates between Brahman and jiva and also recognises Prakrati (matter) as a distinct entity. It thus becomes apparent that Swamiji is able to perceive a harmonious relationship between the six systems, and it cannot be denied that the perception of this fact and its establishment is a stupendous task which requires the profoundest thought and the deepest and subtlest study and enquiry. However, Swami Dayananda's view is undoubtedly an entirely novel one, and it is one that deserves to be considered by scholars. Although a glimpse of harmony is

perceptible in the six systems as they existed in ancient times, this harmony had vanished during the middle ages. In the modern age, Swami Dayananda has revived this thought. As we shall see later, there is considerable validity and force in this viewpoint, and it is not to be rejected easily. The Swamiji's views have since been accepted by numerous latter day scholars.[6]

Swami Dayananda believes that there is a harmonious stream of philosophical thought coursing through the six systems. But by harmony he does not imply a perfect similarity. The Vedic philosophy accepts freedom of thought as an essential element in the discovery of truth. Swami Dayananda's contention of harmony among the six systems implies that each one of these six systems seeks to elaborate the same truth from different points of view. Basically, there is no inherent contradiction between their main principles and theories. The apparent differences can be traced to difference of subject or different modes of expression. Each philosophy has its own subject and a distinct mode of expression. Consequently, it is conceivable that the apparent difference may be due exclusively to a difference of method, and this can, therefore, be eliminated quite easily after due consideration. Another cause of this apparent difference may be the difference in the terminologies employed by the different systems. For example, both Nyaya and Vaisheshika systems refer to God through the word 'Atma' or Soul, i.e 'विभावान्महानाकाशस्तथा चात्मा' Vaisheshika 7 — I — 22. This means that being omnipresent and ubiquitous, the sky and Paramatma are all-pervading. In this aphorism, the word 'atma' has been used for Paramatma or God, whereas it is frequently used to refer to soul or jiva. In the same way, the Sankhya philosophy uses the single term 'purusha' to refer to both Brahman and jiva or soul. If, however, we take no account of the context and interpret the term 'atma' in Nyaya-Vaisheshika and the term 'purusha' in Sankhya to refer to jiva or soul only, we would be compelled to conclude that they are atheistic philosophies.[7] Swami Dayananda explains this anomaly thus: "Vaisheshika and Nyaya too do not become atheistic because of the term 'atma,' because that 'Atma' or Soul which is present everywhere and which possesses the attributes of omniscience, and which is the soul of all jivas, is belived to be God

(Ishwara) by Mimamsa, Vaisheshika and Nyaya."[8] It is obvious, then, that earlier scholars failed to discover this mysterious terminology and hence concluded that the six systems contradict each other. But if these holy texts are carefully studied according to the method elaborated by Dayananda, one becomes conscious of similar theories existing in all the six systems.

It is possible to accept minor differences and contradictions between the six systems, but they do not influence the fundamental principles. For example, in Vedanta philosophy, the seer Badarayana gives his opinion on the question whether the mind is or is not related to the soul in the state of salvation. On this subject he refers two different views of Badari and Gemini. His own opinion differs from the views of Acharya Badari and Gemini. But from this, it should not be concluded that the views of Badari and Gemini contradict each other, and hence that one of them must necessarily be wrong, because Badarayana goes on to declare in the very next aphorism that he accepts both as correct.[9] In the same way, the theory of gunas (Satva, Rajas, Tamas) of Sankhya differs from the theory of quality (guna) of Vaisheshika, as a result of which scholars try to discover contradictions between them. But the Sankhya text itself declares that in its philosophy there is no differentiation of Categories (padartha-bheda) as in the case of the Vaisheshika philosophy.[10] Hence it would be a grave error to interpret the gunas of Sankhya according to the Vaisheshika definition of quality.

The basis on which Swami Dayananda discovers a fundamental harmony in the six Vedic systems is his philosophy of the three eternals (traitvada). He declares that these six systems consider God, the jiva or soul and prakrati or matter as the three eternal elements. So, even if they differ on such questions as the number of sources of knowledge (Pramana), or whether non-existence (abhava) is also a category (padartha) or not, or which is the most superior path to salvation out of the three paths of knowlede, action and worship, it does not materially influence their unity and harmony. He feels that these differences result from the freedom of thought implicit in Vedic thinking, which allows the seer to examine and analyse principles independently and to propagate which he finds to be true. It is the proof of their integrity that they freely expressed whatever they found to be true. This does not imply contradiction be-

cause for all of them the prime source was indentical, i. e., the Vedas, their modes of thought and fundamental principles were also the same. In his answer to those who discover contradictions in these six systems, Sri Nand Lal Sinha comments: "And to those who think that these systems are at daggers drawn with one another, the reply may be given once for all in the felicitious language of Max Mueller, 'The longer I have studied the various systems of ... (the more convinced have I become) that there is behind the variety of the six systems a common fund...."[11]

It appears quite clear from the preceding analysis that Swami Dayananda's view of a harmonious continuity among the six systems of Vedic philosophy was a novel one in the field of philosophy after the middle ages. Though it can be fully validated and established only after profound study. However, it appears that there is considerable substance in the view of Swami Dayananda. The scholars like Aryamuni and Tulsiram Swami wrote commentaries on all the six philosophies, and in them their viewpoints coincided with that of Swami Dayananda. In addition to these efforts, the "Patanjali-Yoga-Pradeepa" of Sri Omananda Tirtha and the "Sanskrit Sahitya Vimarsha" of Shri Dwijendranath Shastri also seek to establish a synthesis between the six systems. All these scholars seem to be deeply influenced by Swami Dayananda.

PRAKRATI (MATTER) IN THE SIX SYSTEMS

Dayananda's Synthesizing Viewpoint

Satkaryavada and Asatkaryavada—The Sankhya philosophy advances the argument that every object in this world has a cause, and that each such cause has its own cause in turn, and thus in proceeding from the effect to the cause, we are compelled to accept the existence of an element which is the first cause of all things, but which is, itself, not the effect of any preceding cause. This element is referred to as 'Prakrati' in this philosophy. It then contends that all material objects of this world are different forms of this non-sentient matter. In addition, it also argues that the effect remains concealed in the cause in a latent state. When it becomes manifest, it is referred to and identified as the effect. The implication of this argument is that, according to Sankhya thinkers, an effect does not arise out of a preceding vaccum or state of non existence, but instead that the effect resides in its cause in

the form of latent energy. Its emergence or evolution is referred to as the effect. The Sankhya philosophy refers to this principle by the term "Satkaryavada". The entire philosophy of the Sankhya thinkers is founded on this principle. It is through this principle that they establish the eternity of prakrati, arguing that all the material objects of the universe must have some ultimate cause in which they existed in an unmanifested form before the act of creation. In their opinion, this substance is prakrati. It becomes apparent to us that this principle establishes prakrati as an eternal substance, a view that is found implicit in the Upanishads at a variety of places. The Chandogya Upanishad states "O Shvetketo ! know thou water as the cause of earth in the form of food (anna), from the effect water know the fire as the cause and from the effect fire know the eternal prakrati as the real and ultimate cause. This eternal prakrati is the original source and place or abode of all material world."[12]

The Nyaya-Vaisheshika school also accepts the existence of prakrati (matter), but instead of supporting the principle of satkaryavada, they propound the theory of asatkaryavada. According to this latter principle, the effect is not latent in the cause, instead, through the evolution or mutation of the seed, a new sapling (a new material) comes into existence, which means that a new material which did not exist earlier comes into existence. In their criticism of Sankhya doctrine of satkaryavada, some commentators argue that if the sapling is already implicit in the seed, then it is pointless to speak of its creation, because one can speak of the creation of only that matter which does not exist before birth, and hence the sapling does not lie nascent in the seed. This argument of the later Nayayikas is countered by the Sankhyans that, according to their theory, the effect exists in the cause before emergence in a potential or unmanifested state. In their opinion, emergence or coming into existence means the manifestation of that which was unmanifested. In addition, the Sankhya thinkers argue that if the pre-existence of the effect in the cause is denied, it will become necessary to posit that existence emerges from nothingness, from a vaccum. Such a concept will undermine the Nyaya concept of prakrati and the material cause. If the emergence of existence from a vaccum is accepted, there is

no need to posit the existence of a material cause, because then it becomes very convenient to assume the emergence of every form of matter from a vaccum.

At this stage, there is no need for us to become immersed in the mutual controversies between the commentators of these two schools, because any such involvement will only take us further away from the real purpose and objective of these aphorisms. The forementioned opposition between satkaryavada and asatkaryavada appears to be an ancient one. In contrast, Dayananda's view is completely opposed to the views involved in this controversy, because he opines that there is no contradiction between these schools of thought. It is conceivable that the seers who initiated these schools of thought had not even an inkling of such a controversial distinction, and that this controversy is merely the result of intellectual exercises on the parts of later scholars of these schools. Hence, in order to arrive at the truth, it appears that the most convenient and suitable method is to have recourse to the original texts. It is one sign of Dayananda's originality that he has invariably turned to the original texts in order to determine the original meaning of principles and theories, instead of depending upon the interpretations of any one commentator, because he believes firmly that the commentator's views are not free from falsehood and doubt.

In the Nyaya philosophy, there is one aphorism 'अभावाद् भावोत्पत्तिर्नानुपमृद्य प्रादुर्भावात्' (Nyaya 4-I-I4) which states that "since the sapling does not emerge without the destruction of the seed, therefore, it implies that things emerge out of non-existence." It appears obvious that the seer is propagating the theory of asatkaryavada through this aphorism. But Swami Dayananda declares this aphorism to be the aphorism of adversary (purvapakshi), and in answer states that, "that which emerges from the seed must have existed in the seed prior to emergence, otherwise it could never have been born."[13] This makes it apparent that Swami Dayananda's interpretation of the above aphorism is completely different from the views of later Nayayikas, and hence his conception of the Nyaya principle of asatkaryavada is also at variance with their explanation. Here, it can be objected that Dayananda has deliberately declared this aphorism belonging to adversary, in order to suit his own view. In answer to this charge, we submit

that this is not the case, since this view is not merely Swami Dayananda's but also that of Vatsyayana Muni, the famous and authoritative commentator on Nyaya philosophy. He too accepts this aphorism as being the view of adversary (purvapakshi). Shri Ganganath Jha, Swami Tulsiram and Shri Satish Chandra Vidyabhushan, Principal of the Sanskrit College, Calcutta, are also of the same view.[14] Not merely this, further proof is to be found in the immediately succeeding aphorism 'व्याघातादप्रयोग:' (Nyaya 4.1.15) means that "The reasoning put forward is unsound, as it involves self-contradiction." (Vatsyayan Bhasya, translated by Ganga Nath Jha). This same aphorism is interpreted in the following manner by Satish Chandra Vidyabhusan thus : "It is we reply, not so, because such an expression, inconsistent as it is, cannot be employed."[15] This leads to the impression that Nyaya philosophy rejects the possibility of existence emerging from non-existence. At another place, Nyaya philosophy explicitly accepts the inherence of whole in the parts, or of the effect in the cause.[16] The view we have expressed is supported by Dr. Radhakrishnan's statement that "The Nayayika concedes that a complete destruction of the previous substances will make the formation of the new impossible. It follows that the substance only relinquishes its former condition though the Nayayaka is not inclined to accept it openly"[17] Thus, it is made obvious, both by Nyaya philosophy itself as well as by numerous scholars that the Nyaya concept of asatkaryavada does not imply that the effect is an entirely new entity or that before emergence it was completely absent from the cause.

Since the Vaisheshika philosophy is parallel to the Nyaya philosophy, the critical rejection of asatkaryavada as implying the emergence of existence from non-existence is equally applicable to it. The critic interprets the Vaisheshika aphorism 'क्रिया गुणव्यपदेशाऽभावात्प्रागऽसत्'[18] to mean that in the absence of quality and action there was non-existence of the effect before its emergence. Such a statement once again raises the suspicion whether, through this aphorism, the Vaisheshika philosophy is seeking to propound the principle of asatkaryavada, thus implying the emergence of existence from non-existence. However, an understanding of the other Vaisheshika principles, its fundamental idea and the preceding as well as the succeeding context of aphorisms clarifies its real intent.

At this stage, the Vaisheshika acceptance of the non-existence of the effect in the cause, due to the absence of actions and qualities implies that since the effect has yet to emerge, it must lack its functions and qualities. Here, the philosophers say clearly that the earth and other substances were non-existent before they emerged because, at that time, these substances were devoid of their functions and qualities. For example, before the creation of a pot, along with its functions and qualities, all that existed was the clay and its functions and qualities. The clay gave existence to the pot, implying that the change in the name and form of the clay led to the creation of a new substance called the pot, which was in fact an another form of the clay. Hence the pot did pre-exist in the clay but when it became manifest it came to be accepted as being born a new. And we find that Vaisheshika too accepts that the effect exists in the cause by inherence (samvaaya).[19]

It certainly appears from the preceding analysis that even in the principle of asatkaryavada, the emergence of the effect is presumed from within the cause. But when the Nyaya and Vaisheshika speak of the effect being non-existent in the cause, what they, in fact, mean is that the present form of the effect is not observable in the cause. The composer of the Nyaya Manjari states that they (the Nayayikas) do not accept that any object, which has non-existence, can be born; instead, we say that which is born was lacking,[20] which means that it was lacking in that specific form. Thus, it is apparent that there is no contradiction between the principles of satkaryavada and asatkaryavada, that the difference lies in the varying modes of elaboration adopted by the two schools. Both of them accept that the effect emerges from the cause, and its corollary that the effect cannot exist if the cause does not.[21] They further agree that the qualities of the cause transfer themselves to the effect.[22] Both systems accept prakrati or matter as the material cause. In this way, the present discussion leads us to the conclusion that there is no inherent contradiction between satkaryavada and Asatkaryavada, and hence Swami Dayananda's arguments appear to be entirely rational.

THE ATOMISM (PARMANUVADA) OF VAISHESHIKA AND THE THEORY OF GUNAS (GUNAVADA) OF SANKHYA

The Vaisheshika philosophy accepts the theory of atoms (parmanu) while the Sankya system advocates the theory of gunas. The former believes that an atom is that smallest particle of matter (prakrati) beyond which subdivision is impossible. Every substance has its own atoms which combine with each other in greater or lesser numbers to give rise to a variety of other things. The combination of two or more than two of these atoms leads to the formation of bigger molecules which then become the elements for the further formation of various substances. Nyaya-Vaisheshika did not go beyond the concept of the atom. According to them the entire universe is the result of the atoms alone. Among western physicists, the concept of atomism introduced by Dalton appears to be extremely close to the Vaisheshika concept.

On the other hand, Sankhya philosophy conceives of prakrati or matter as being composed of the three gunas of satva, rajas and tamas. When matter exists in an unmanifested state, these three gunas exist in a state of perfect equilibrium. Once this equilibrium is disturbed, these three gunas combine in various degrees and varying extents to give rise to the various objects of the universe. Sankhya philosophy refers to this state as the manifest state of prakrati. This view appears to be in direct opposition to the atomism of Nyaya and Vaisheshika, but if harmony is to be established, it is necessary to examine this opposition and to disprove it, if possible.

Swami Dayananda is essentially a synthesist, and consequently he opines that there is no essential contradiction between the atomism of Vaisheshika and the Sankhya concept of nature (prakrati). In his opinion, these six systems of Indian philosophy look at six different aspects of the emergence of creation. For example, Mimamsa discusses the desire for action or karma as the root cause of creation, Vaisheshika the presence of time, Nyaya mainly discusses the material cause of the creation, Sankhya visualizes it as the combining of elements while Vedanta focusses on Brahman, the creator of creation.[23] This makes it amply clear that Dayananda does not accept the fact of any con-

tradiction between the atomism of Vaisheshika and the Sankhya concept of prakrati of gunas. In the succeeding paragraphs we shall see how far Swami Dayananda's view can be justified through these two systems of thought.

The views of Swami Dayananda give the impression that he believed the Sankhya concept of prakrati in the state of equilibrium of the three gunas satva, rajas and tamas to be more subtle then the Nyaya view of prakrati as composed of atoms. When the equilibrium of prakrati is disturbed, the extremely subtle atoms emerge discretely, that is, as individual entities. Swamiji opines that "the eternal and infinite prakrati, which is the equilibrium of the three gunas of satva, rajas and tamas, gives rise to separate atoms which are extremely subtle, and these atoms at first combine and then through the mutations and variations of these combinations prakrati assumes gradually more and more concrete forms, because of which this combination is given the name of creation."[24] In other words, the state of equilibrium of satva, rajas and tamas is designated prakrati by Sankhya thinkers. When this equilibrium was disturbed, a chain of distortions was set off. The first development of prakrati was 'Mahat' which can be called the universal intellect or the universal internal organ (विश्वान्त:करण) inhering everywhere in nature. The second thing to emerge was ego (ahamkara). This ego led to the emergence of the process of separateness in the creation. Sri Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak believes that atoms emerged at this stage of evolution.[25] But Das Gupta believes that atoms came into existence after the five subtle elements (tanamatra).[26] Here, we are not primarily concerned with the stage in which atoms emerged. All that is important for our argument is that the first stage of prakrati was the existence of satva, rajas and tamas in a state of equilibrium and that, later on, atoms emerged either before or after the five subtle elements. The Sankhya view of creation after the emergence of atoms adheres fairly closely to the Nyaya-Vaisheshika concept, and it, therefore, appears that Sankhya philosophy reached a higher level of subtle thinking than the Nyaya or Vaisheshika. The latter failed to go beyond the concept of the atom whereas the Sankhya thinkers were able to visualize an even subtler level of existence, that of satva, rajas and tamas. This does not suggest that their respective theories conflict with each other or that they are basically different.

Contradiction occurs when there are two opposing views on the same subject. Here the difference lies in a higher and lower level of visualization. On this subject, Swami Omananda expresses views similar to those of Swami Dayananda. He suggests that "the point from where the Nyaya-Vaisheshika system has demonstrated the process of concrete creation is also the point from which the Sankhya thinkers proceeded in the search of more subtler states of prakrati which comprehends all material substances, ubiquitous as well as subtle atoms. This material entity was composed of three gunas of satva, rajas and tamas."[27]

On the subject, Sankhya thinkers themselves express the same view that atoms emerge later from the qualities or gunas, ('नाणु नित्यता तत्कार्यत्वश्रुतेः' Sankhya-Sutra 5.87) which means that "atoms are not eternal because the fact of their being effects, as distinct from causes, is stated in the Shruti."

Some scholars are of the opinion that the guna cannot live apart from its substance, and hence the three gunas—satva, rajas and tamas—must have some material basis. They further say that there are three kinds of atoms. Some have the quality of satva, because of which they are light and luminous, some have the quality of rajas which makes them active or energetic, while those of the tamas class are extremely heavy and incapable of motion. Such a view is entirely fallacious because Sankhya itself declares that atom is not eternal because it is an effect, as the Shruti says (Sankhya-Sutra 5.87) Further, Sankhya philosophy does not classify substances in the same manner as Vaisheshika does.[28] **Consequently, it is erroneous to equate the three gunas propounded by Sankhya with the Vaisheshika concept of qualities.** For the Vaisheshika, the term is taken to mean quality which inheres in the substance, whereas the Sankhya conceives of gunas as prakrati or matter itself. Sankhya philosophy states explicitly that "satva, rajas and tamas are not qualities because they are the constituents of prakrati",[29] meaning thereby that these three are themselves matter, and not the qualities of some other substance. The famous commentator on Sankhya aphorisms, Vigyan Bhikshu, says that satva, rajas and tamas are substance themselves and not the qualities akin to the Vaisheshika concept because they take part in creating the objects by way of uniting and disuniting.[30] Consequently, the gunas of Sankhya philosophy are not the qualities of atoms but the original causes of atoms.

The question that now arises is, if the atoms are accepted as effects, according to Swami Dayananda's view, then how can the state of atom be called prakrati, when prakrati is the name given to the state of equilibrium of the three gunas satva, rajas and tamas. It is our opinion that the atomic state of matter can also be called prakrati, since the concrete creation of the universe starts from that state, and hence that state is a cause of creation of the world. According to Sankhya philosophy, there are three stages in the progress from prakrati to the world of manifestation (1) Prakrati—the state of equilibrium of the three gunas, (2) Prakrati—Vikrati—this comprehends the evolution of universal mind (mahatatva), ego and five subtle elements (panchtanmatras), (3) Vikrati-all the eleven sense organs including the mind, as well as the five gross elements (mahabhuta).[31] Now, even if it is presumed that the atoms come into existence in the state of 'subtle' elements (tanmatras), they can still be comprehended under the second stage of evolution, and consequently this stage can be referred to as prakrati. In view of this, there appears to be no impropriety committed by the Vaisheshikas in referring the state of atoms of substance as prakrati.

Swami Dayananda's view that atoms are the effects of gunas and that a guna is the most subtle state of prakrati, appears from the preceding analysis to be very sound. In this way, the controversy on the nature of prakrati in these two systems of thought is more or less resovled.

ACCEPTANCE OF PRAKRATI OR MATTER IN VEDANTA SUTRAS

Vedanta philosophy is of especial significance among the six systems of Vedic philosophy. It contains primarily an account of Brahman. The majority of Vedic philosophers inclines to the view that the Vedanta is a monistic or non-dualistic system of thought, and that it does not contribute to the view of prakrati as an entity existing separately from Brahman. Consequently, in this system, such scholars focus their attention on the concept of Maya elaborated by Shankara. In the opinion of Shankaracharya, the Brahma-Sutra or Vedanta accepts Prakrati as Maya, the distorting power of Brahman, and consequently this non-dualistic theory supports the illusory nature of this universe. On the other hand, Ramanujacharya supports

the Vishishtadvaita theory within this system. He accepts the reality of the world, but he also believes that prakrati is only a part of Brahman. Ramanuja accepts the existence of prakrati in Brahman by internal difference (स्वगत भेद). Infact, prakrati is a mode (प्रकार) of Brahman.

On the question of prakrati being present in Vedanta, the views of Swami Dayananda differ markedly from those of the above-mentioned philosophers. He argues that the Brahma-Sutras accept prakrati as an eternal element independent of Brahman.[32] Even before Swami Dayananda, the tendency to accept the Brahma-Sutras as realistic is noticeable. Among the most noted of the ancient commentaries on the Brahma-Sutra, the one by Maharishi Bodhayana was a realistic commentary. And it is this which has been accepted as authoritative by Sawami Dayananda.[33] Thus, it is reasonable to conclude that this commentary must have been a realistic one.

Maharishi Dayananda has not composed any systematic commentary on the Brahma-Sutra himself, but his views concerning this text can be obtained from his frequent references to it and the frequent use he has made of its aphorisms to substantiate his views. Consequently, in our attempt to validate Dayananda's views, it is necessary for us to reflect directly upon the Brahma-Sutras themselves.

A study of the original Brahma-Sutra or Vedanta philosophical text indicates that this system does not treat the world as illusory. Instead, it has in fact refuted the views of those who believe the world to be like a dream. On one occasion, Maharishi Badarayana, when comparing the waking and dream worlds, says that the waking world cannot be illusory like the world of dreams because there is a qualitative difference between the two.[34] In other words, the objects of the dream world are found sublated in the waking world, whereas the existence of the objects of the waking world are never sublated. They retain their existence despite change of time and place. Hence, it is illogical to substitute the objects of the waking world with those of the dream world. In another aphorism, the author regards the objects of the dream world as illusory because their form is not distinct.[35] It becomes clear from these two instances that the composer of the Brahma-Sutra regarded the waking

world neither as illusory nor as identical with the dream world. In the Brahma-Sutra, prakrati has been referred to as the material cause of the universe. "Like the cloth पटवच्च" (V. Su. 2. 1. 19). In this aphorism, the composer assumes that the world was latent in its cause prakrati before its evolution. Just as a piece of cloth appears small when folded but spreads out when unfolded, the universe, too, before its creation, remains hidden in unmanifested form in prakrati, its ultimate cause, but becomes manifest after creation. This argument suggests that Vedanta philosophy appears to be propagating the concept of transformation (parinamavada) in accordance with the theory of satkaryavada propounded by the Sankhya thinkers. In addition, Vedanta refers to Brahman as the efficient (nimitta) cause of the universe. The Shastra declares that "prakrati is meaningful only in its subordination to Paramatma. "तदधीत्वात् अर्थवत् (V. Su. 1. 4. 3). This implies that in its non-manifested state, prakrati continues to exist in subordination to Brahman, and even when it becomes manifest, it functions under His direction, and in this alone lies the meaningfulness of prakrati. This suggests that the composer accepts the existence of prakrati aven before creation, he does not believe in its non-existence. Even Shankaracharya has accepted the existence of prakrati prior to creation in his own commentary on this aphorism and stated that the denial of the existence of prakrati before creation would nullify the idea that Brahman is the creator of the universe. Consequently, he admits that, before creation, prakrati existed in subordination to Brahman.[36] However, Shankaracharya introduces at this point his notion of the three levels of existence, and argues that these aphorisms refer to the practical level of existence (व्यावहारिक सत्ता). He opines that Brahman possesses the attributes of creator, only when viewed from the practical level, therefore, wherever the aphorisms refer to creation, they speak of the empirical world. But it is pertinent on our part to ask: where do the aphorisms themselves refer to distinct levels of existence ? The truth is that Vedanta philosophy itself provides such a detailed and crystal-clear account of the reality of the universe that Shankaracharya was compelled to attribute the distinction in the levels of existence to the texts in order to defend his non-dualistic theory.

Infact, Vedantic aphorisms accept neither the principle of Maya propounded by Shankaracharya, nor different levels of existence. As opposed to this, we find Badarayana saying specifically that "prakrati exists on account of its not being incompatible with proposition and example."[37]

The fact, that Vedanta philosophy does not accept the principle of Maya, is a view held not only by Swami Dayananda but numerous other scholars. In his book "Patanjala Yoga Pradeep," Swami Omananda declares that the Brahma-Sutra believes in transformation theory (parinamavad) and not in perversion theory (vivartavad).[38] In his view, in the aphorism 'आत्मकृते: परिणामात्' (V. Su. 1.4.26), the composer clearly points towards transformation (Parinama). Infact, the principle of Maya was attributed to the Brahma-Sutra by the neo-vedantists. He states that, "If one glances at the original aphorisms of Badarayana without scholastic prejudice and with independent judgement, it appears quite distinctly that like other philosophies (Nyaya, Vaisheshika, Sankhya and Yoga), these aphorisms, too, propound the dualistic principle of Sankhya and Yoga."[39]

The foregoing analysis establishes clearly that Vedanta accepts the existence of prakrati, and that the Shastra itself does not reflect the principle of Maya. Swami Dayananda gives the opinion that according to Vedanta philosophy, God or Ishwara is the efficient (nimitta) cause of creation, while the material cause is the eternal prakrati. This view is not only logical, but it appears to be in complete consonance with the original intent of the aphorisms.

DISTINCTION BETWEEN BRAHMAN AND JIVA IN VEDANTA

We have already made it quite clear that Swami Shankaracharya's non-dualistic commentary on the Braham-Sutra does not provide a correct elucidation of it. In fact, instead of elaborating the philosophical thought of Badarayana, it actually throws light upon the view of Gaudpada. In connection with this question, the famous Indian scholar Sri Surendranath Das Gupta expresses the view that prior to Shankara and Gaudpada, no one had attempted a monistic elaboration of Vedanta-Sutras apart from the Upanishads.[40] This view is in consonance with

the realistic views of Swami Dayananda. According to Shankara's interpretation of Vedanta or Braham-Sutra everything apart from Brahman is Maya or illusion. Even the jiva is nothing more than a part of Brahman, though it is equipped with the adjunct of ignorance,

What, according to Vedanta philosophy, is the nature of jiva ? Is the jiva only a form of Brahman ? Such and other related questions are that of great significance for a realistic thinker. Maharishi Dayananda is perfectly clear about their answers. In his view, the Vedanta clearly accepts the separate existence of Brahman and the jiva, and thus they refute Shankara's claim that Brahman and jiva are identical. He supports his view with reference to many Vedanta aphorisms. In his "Satyartha Prakash," he refers at one point to the aphorism "नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः:" (V. Su. 1. 1. 16) and exemplifies its meaning thus: "As distinct from Brahman, the jiva is incapable of creation because creative power cannot be manifested by this small, being (jiva) which has limited powers, and hence the jiva cannot be Brahman."[41] Shankara has also interpreted this aphorism in the same manner, but he then introduces into it the concept of ignorance, and thence argues that since the jiva is qualified by ignorance, he only appears to be distinct from Brahman. This is true not only of this particulara phorism but all other aphorisms. Wherever the Vedanta speaks of the distinction between Brahman and jiva, Shankar interprets it with reference to ignorance as a quality of the jiva and thus seeks to establish his non-dualistic theory.[42] If we accept this viewpoint and the fact of ignorance being a distinguishing characteristic of the jiva, it is possible to consider Vedanta philosophy to be monistic. But the question that must first be answered is whether the Braham-Sutras do contain Mayavada ? Do they distinguish between the empirical (vyavaharika) and the transcendental (paramarthika) existences ? And if, in complete indifference to the real sentiment and purpose of the Vedanta, we wilfully impose Mayavada and theory of adjunct (upadhivada) upon the Braham-Sutra or Vedanta, would it not amount to a deliberate distortion of the real intention of the texts ? As for as the Braham-Sutras are concerned, Ramanuja is more explicit than Shankara, and it appears that the former is more successful in approximating to

their real intent. Ramanujacharya establishes the relationship of part and whole between jiva and Brahman. He is of the view that the jiva does not come into existence becanse of ignorance but is enternal and infinite. Since Brahman is even more subtle than the jiva, He inheres in the jiva, and consequently, the jiva is like a body of the Brahman. This also explains the relationship between jive and Brahman in terms of body and soul (शरीर-शरीरी). Ramanuja's view is that jivas are eternal and innumerable in number, and though they are similar in form, they are distinct because of their being many in number.[43]

Swami Dayananda emphasizes the distinction between Brahman and jiva through his analysis of the following ten Vedantic aphorisms:—

1. नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः | 1·1·16 |
2. भेदव्यपदेशाच्च | 1·1·17 |
3. विशेषण भेद व्यपदेशाभ्यां च नेतरौ | 1·2·22 |
4. अस्मिन्नस्य च तद्योगं शास्ति | 1·1·19 |
5. अन्तस्तद्धर्मोपदेशात् | 1·1·20 |
6. भेदव्यपदेशाच्चान्यः | 1·1·21 |
7. गुहां प्रविष्टावात्मानौ हि तद्दर्शनात् | 1·2·11 |
8. अनुपपत्तेस्तु न शारीरः | 1·2·3 |
9. अन्तर्याम्यधिदैवादिषु तद्धर्मव्यपदेशात् | 1·2·18 |
10. शारीरश्चोभयेऽपिहि भेदेनैनमधीयते | 1·2·20 |

Swami Dayananda declares that the foregoing aphorisms clearly establish the distinction between Brahman and jiva. In his commentary he writes[44]—

(1) "Apart from the Brahman, the jiva is not the creator, because the power of creativity and the act of creation cannot inhere in the jiva who is limited in knowledge and power. Therefore, jiva cannot be identical with Brahman."

(2) 'रसंह्येवायं लब्ध्वानन्दी भवति' "This is an Upanishadic statement and it implies that Brahman and jiva are different because their difference has been propounded. If this had not been the case, jiva as a subject would have not been stated to have achieved the state of bliss by the attainment of Brahman, as an object of achievment, who is perfect Bliss. There being the difference of object and subject, the jiva cannot be Brahman."

(3) "There is a description of difference concerning the nature and adjectives of both prakrati or nature and jiva with that

of Brahman. Therefore, Brahman is different from prakrati and jiva both." (see Mundakopanishad also 2. 1. 2)

(4) "The fact, that the jiva can achieve union with this omnipresent Brahman, and the fact that this has been so propounded, establishes that jiva and Brahman are distinct because union can take place only between two distinct entities."

(5) "Brahman is referred to as inherent in all things, and since Brahman inheres in the jiva also, there is a clear distinction between that which inheres and that in which He inheres. This relationship of inherence also establishes distinction."

(6) "Just as Paramatma is distinct from the jiva, He is also distinct from learned seers who have achieved divinity, due to their having achieved true knowledge of mind and elements like earth space air, sun etc."

(7) "'गुहां प्रविष्टौ सुकृतस्य लोके' and numerous other statements in the Upanishads clearly distinguish between Brahman and the jiva. This is demonstrated at many places in the Upanishads."

(8) "'शरीरेभव: शारीर:' the jiva who assumes a body is not Brahman because the qualities, actions and nature of Brahman are never obtained in the jiva."

(9) "Parmatma inheres in (अधिदेव) all vital things like mind, senses etc., (अधिभूत) subtle and gross elements like earth, and (अध्यात्म) all the jivas. Because the characteristics like inherence have been attributed to Him in the Upanishads."

(10) "The jiva who assumes a body is not Brahman because the distinction between them is incontrovertible because of the difference in there nature."

The basis, on which Swami Dayananda has established the distinction between Brahman and jiva through the foregoing aphorisms, is that Vedanta philosophy accepts Brahman and not jiva as the creator of the universe. Therefore, both are distinct and separate. One is omnipotent while the other enjoys limited powers. Besides, the aphorisms also suggest that there is union or contact between Brahman and jiva, and this is inconceivable if they are not distinct from each other. The distinction between the worshipper and the worshipped further supports this contention. In addition, the aphorisms declare that the jiva assumes a body, while Brahman does not. The aphorism 1. 2. 11 of Brahma-Sutra as referred above declares that the conjunction of Brahman and jiva is in the heart, and even conjunction cannot

be conceived of if they are not initially distinct. The composer of these aphorisms goes on to declare that according to Shruti, there is difference between the adjectives referrable to the jiva and those referring to Brahman, and this also supports this view of distinction. (See Brahma Su. 1. 2. 22)

Apart from these aphorisms, there are numerous others aphorisms in Vedanta philosophy which bear out Dayananda's contention. For instance, it has been said that Paramatma is greater than the jiva,[45] the jiva has an innate tendency to enjoy the fruits of his actions, which Paramatma does not possess,[46] the jiva is atomic,[47] (Shankara's commentary also on this aphorism accepts that the jiva is atomic, but in order to establish his non-dualistic philosophy, he applies the concept of adjunct or upadhi at this juncture). The sub chapter fourth (pada) of the fourth chapter of Brahma-Sutra establishes even more explicitly the distinction between jiva and Brahman. Here Badarayana poses the question whether the mind (मन:) remains with the jiva in the state of salvation or not? And then he refers to the view of Badri that there exists only mind (मन), the principle of thought in the salvation.[48] Whereas, Gemini argues that in salvation, the mind (मन:), subtle body, vital forces i. e. pranas and senses accompany the jiva as a means.[49] On this subject, Badarayana then expresses his own view that he accepts both viewpoints, i. e. the presence as well as absence of means when the jiva is in a state of salvation.[50] Here, the significant question is: if Brahman and jiva are identical, then what is the significance of raising the question whether the mind remains with the jiva or not in salvation? And, then in a state of salvation, the jiva should become one with the Brahman. But Badarayan refuses the notion of identification between jiva and Brahman in the state of salvation. If he had accepted the view, he would not have accepted the presence of manas in salvation. This suggests quite clearly that Badarayan admits the distinction between jiva and Brahman. In the immediately succeeding aphorisms, he goes on to say that the liberated soul obtains numerous other capabilities, but he cannot assume the power of creation of the universe.[51] If the jiva had been Brahman, then in salvation he would have become Brahman, and thus there could have been no question about his creatorship. The very fact that the jiva lacks this capability demonstrates his difference from Brahman because creation lies within the powers of Brahman alone.

Dayananda's interpretation of the Vedantic view of the distinction between Brahman and jiva appears to be logical. Though he has not written extensively on these aphorisms, he is, nevertheless, able to provide for us a new viewpoint on the basis of which it is possible to make a realistic commentary on the entire Vedanta philosophy from the angle of the theory of three eternals.

GOD IN SANKHYA PHILOSOPHY

Among the six Vedic systems of thought, Sankhya has a place of special significance. The philosophy was initiated by Maharishi Kapil, a great scholar who had profound faith in Vedic literature. Despite this, Sankhya philosophy has been regarded as atheistic in philosophic circles. Scholars are of the opinion that Sankhya gives prime importance to conscious 'purusha' or jiva and inert matter (jada pradhana), and then posits that creation takes place through the union of these two entities Before creation, prakarati remains unmanifested in a state in which satva, rajas and tamas are in equilibrium When the purusha comes in contact with prakrati in its unmanifested state, its equilibrium is disturbed, and consequently the process of creation is automatically initiated according to natural laws. According to these scholars Sankhya had no need to posit the existence of God as the prime cause of creation. Therefore, Maharishi Kapil gave no place to God in his philosophy. As a result, this philosophy is regarded as an atheistic system. But, this raises an obvious question : If Sankhya does not accept the existence of God, then why is it considered a part of the Vedic or theistic systems of thought ? The scholars answer this query by arguing that in Vedic philosophy, the terms atheistic or theistic do not imply acceptance or rejection of God. Instead, the system which accept the Vedas as self-evident or authoritative are regarded as theistic while those which reject this view are treated as atheistic. In support, they quote Manu who said "नास्तिको वेद निन्दकः" Manu 2.11 'atheist it that who rejects the Vedas with contempt'. Since Sankhya holds the Vedas as self-evident, it is classed among the theistic or Vedic systems of thought However, this scholarly argument does not convince us, since it seems unreasonable to class a system as theistic only if it accepts the Vedas as authoritative, irrespective of its faith in God or lack of it. In our opinion, any system which accepts the Vedas as authoritative cannot reject the existence of God, because each one of the four Vedas repeatedly refers to and

expounds upon the nature of God. Consequently, Sankhya philosophy must also accept the existence of God, if it treats the Vedas as self-evident. In view of this, it is difficult to understand how Sankhya is treated as an atheistic system of thought Is it not possible that these scholars are harbouring some misconception and, therefore, express such an opinion ?

Dayananda is perfectly clear about this question. He declares firmly that Sankhya philosophy is theistic system, and that the allegation of atheism on Kapil Maharishi is a misconceived one.[52] In his opinion, Sankhya philosophy provides a description of God as the efficient cause of creation, the distributor of the fruits of actions, the original source of the Vedas, etc. This declaration on the part of Dayananda is a very courageous one, and thus it is very important to evaluate its propriety and accuracy.

Swami Dayananda's view that the Sankhya philosophy is a theistic one will be examined here from two angles—(1) a study of Vedic literature other than the Sankhya texts themselves, and (2) the theistic elements discoverable in the Sankhya texts themselves.

(1) **Agreement of other Vedic texts on Sankhya philosophy**—Sankhya philosophy has its own significant place in Vedic literature. Because of the knowledge contained in Sankhya-Sutras, both the system and its initiator Maharishi Kapil have received ample praise. It is stated in Shvetashvetaro Upanishad that Maharishi Kapil was directly enlightened by God. The Upanishad states "ऋषिं प्रसूतं कपिलं यस्तमग्रे ज्ञानैर्बिभर्ति[53]", meaning that Paramatma filled first born Kapil Muni with knowledge. This clearly indicates that Maharishi Kapil possessed divine knowledge (Brahamajyana), and that this knowledge was imparted to him by God Himself. In addition, the Mahabharata tells us that Kapil was one of the seven mental sons of Brahma—Sanatkumar, Sanak, Sanandan, Sanatsujata, Sun, Sanatana and Kapil (Shanti Parva. 340–72). He was the possesser of divine knowledge from his very birth, and his Sankhya philosophy was highly valued and respected among the Aryan kings. Mahabharat says that Panchshikha the disciple of Asuri (who was a Sankhyan) enlightened Maharaja Janak with Sankhya knowledge. Accepting the utility of Sankhya knowledge, Bhisma declared that the Sankhya view of the origin of creation was adopted by the Puranas, and thus became a part of history. Not merely this, it has also been said that "ज्ञानं च लोके यदि हास्ति किंचित्

सांख्यगतं तच्च महन्महात्मन्" (M. Sha. P. 301.108, 109). meaning that all the knowledge that exists in the world is obtainable in Sankhya literature. Consequently, it is not surprising to see that Vedic literature in its entirety accepts the utility and value of Kapil's knowledge. It was because of his immeasurable knowledge, that Kapil was given the title of Paramrishi—"सांख्यस्य वक्ता कपिलः परमर्षिः स उच्यते" (Maha Bha. Sh. P. 349-65).

In addition to the above facts, Maharishi Kapil **has been** declared the highest yogi and possesser of divine knowledge even in the Gita. Yogiraja Krishna was himself the highest Yogi and possessor of divine knowledge. Hindu religious texts consider him to be God or Brahman. Elaborating on his own powers, Lord Krishna declares in Gita that "सिद्धानां कपिलो मुनिः : (Gita, 10-26), meaning that among the Yogins I am Kapil Muni. The obvious question is that if Kapil were an atheist, is it conceivable that Lord Krishna would have sought to compare himself with Kapil ? Was there no other Yogi and possessor of divine knowledge among all the Upanishadic seers who was superior to Kapil Muni (who has been categorized as an atheist) with whom Lord Krishna could have more appropriately compared himself ? From his very birth, Kapil Muni had attained divine glory, purity, knowledge, perfect dispassion and felicity, and it is because of this that Lord Krishna chose him for comparison from among all divine seers. This is sufficient to establish that Kapil Muni was no atheist, that in fact he was one of the supreme seers among all Vedic seers. It is thus apparent to us that along with Mahabharata, the Gita, the Upanishads, and all the other Vedic religious texts refute the view that Kapil or his Sankhya philosophy could be called atheistic. Dr. Radhakrishnan has clearly stated that two great teachers of Sankhya philosophy, Asuri and Panchshikha, were both theists.[54].

REASON FOR CONSIDERING SANKHYA AS ATHEISTIC

An analysis of Sanskrit literature shows that the tendency to consider Sankhya an atheistic philosophy originated in the middle ages. The reasons behind this were mainly two—(1) The Sankhyakarika of Ishwara Krishna, and (2) Shankaracharya's criticism of Sankhya philosophy in his writings and calling it atheistic.

(i) **The Sankhyakarika of Ishwara Krishna** – The Sankhyakarika was composed by Ishwara Krishna, and its composition is such that it gives its readers the impression that the universe can

be created even in the absence of God.[55] Scholars treat the Karikas as more ancient than the Sankhya aphorisms. And, treating the Sankhya-Karika as the first source of Sankhya philosophy, they feel justified in holding Sankhya as an atheistic system. But in our opinion, such scholars have erred in forming this view.

The first proponent of Sankhya philosophy was Maharishi Kapil, and Asuri was his disciple. Among the later propagators of this system, known to us. were Panchashikha, Jaigashvaracharya, Vindhyavasi (Rudrila), Parashar, Vyas, Ishwar Krishna and Vigyana Bhikshu. Sankhya literature tells us that Maharishi Kapil imparted the principles of Sankhya to Asuri, and it was this discourse that later on came to be identified as Sankhya philosophy. It was expressed in aphoristic form. This knowledge was then transmitted by Asuri to Panchasikha, and it was he who elaborated it. Later on Varshaganyacharya composed a text entitled "Shashti-tantra" which contained an elaboration of sixty main subjects It was on the basis of this text that Ishwar Krishna Arya composed the "Sankhyakarika", which shows that Ishwar Krishna's creation, when considered chronologically, came much later. Prior to it, at least two important texts, "Sankhya-Sutra" and "Shashti-tantra" had already been composed. The Sankhya-karika of Ishwar Krishna was composed after the Sankhya aphorisms. Swapaneshwar, the composer of Kaumudi-Prabha, declares that Sankhya-Sutras were composed by Panchasikha, who had received them by way of tradition from Kapil. In the Bhagwat, there is mention of the fact that a large part of Sankhya philosophy was destroyed in its passage through time and that the remnants available to us form only a very small part of the original.[56] Vigyan Bhikshu's "Samkhya-pravachan-bhashya" was composed on the basis of these aphorisms. In his *Introduction* to his commentary he states that time has destroyed a large part of Sankhya literature, that in his commentary he would supplement the remnants.[57] Some scholars hold to the view that the "Sankhya-karika" belongs to an earlier time than the "Sankhya-pravachan-sutra." In support of this contention, they argue that Shankaracharya has made no mention of these aphorisms in his texts, and also that the commentator Vachaspati Mishra, who composed a commentary on the Sankhya-karika, had no knowledge of them, and hence these aphorisms have not been uttered by Kapil. They further contend that the composition was mainly the work of Vigyan Bhikshu. In

our opinion, this is not the correct view because a century before Vigyan Bhikshu (in the fifteenth century) Anirudha had composed a text entitled "Sankhyavratisutra", based on the same Sankhya–Pravachan-Sutra, which lends substance to the view that the Sankhya-Sutra precedes Vigyan Bhikshu in time. Besides, his disciple Bhavaganesha, has declared frequently in his text "Tatvayatharthaya-depana" that Vigyan Bhikshu had composed a commentary on these aphorisms.

As far as the "Sankhyakarika" is concerned, its very name indicates that it was composed for the purpose of elucidating the Sankhya philosophical texts which existed before it. Hence, this text cannot be more ancient than Sankhya-Sutra. One can ask another question at this point : if the Sankhyakarika was composed later than the Sankhya-Sutra, why does it enjoy greater repute and popularity than the Sankhya-Sutras themselves ? In our opinion, the reason for this is that the original aphorism are stated in highly complex and cryptic form, which is difficult to interpret, whereas the poetic form of the Sankhyakarika is simpler and more easily comprehended, and that is why many scholars limited their studies to it.

(ii) **Shankara's criticism of Sankhya**—Shankara's mayavada or theory of illusion is the very antithesis of the realism of Sankhya. Shankara treated prakrati as maya while the Sankhya thinkers accept it as real. Among the six systems of Indian thought, it was the Sankhya philosophy that was the most grave threat to Shankara's theory of maya, and consequently it became the main target of his criticism. In this, it was, ironically, the Sankhyakarika which gave him greatest help. We have already pointed out that Ishwar Krishna's, "Sankhyakarika" appears to be an atheistic text. In fact, Shankaracharya took advantage of the indifference towards God manifested in this text and used it to establish the atheistic impression of the system. In his own compositions, Shankara did not refer to any of the aphorism of the Sankhya philosophy. And, this started a trend among commentators who followed Shankara and they all branded Sankhya philosophy as an atheistic system of thought.

In this way, we can see that scholars denigrated a perfectly theistic Sankhya philosophy as an atheistic one merely in order to protect and propagate their own theories. It was in the sixteenth century that Vigyan Bhikshu launched a counter-offensive against

this tendency. Instead of the Sankhyakarika, he accepted the Sankhya-Sutra as the authoritative Sankhya text and he composed a commentary on it entitled "Sankhya-Pravachan-Bhasya", which is explicitly theistic. In the modern age, it was Swami Dayananda who once again accepted and propagated the theistic interpretation of Sankhya philosophy. He is of the view that the Sankhya-Pravachan-Sutra, which is available today, is the composition of Kapil, and further regards the commentary on it by Bhaguri Muni as authoritative.[58] It is certain that this commentary must have been of a theistic inclination.

EVIDENCE OF THE SANKHYA-SUTRAS WHICH ESTABLISH SANKHYA AS A THEISTIC PHILOSOPHY

After the preceding analysis, we will now turn to an examination of the Sankhya-Sutras themselves to find further evidence supporting the view that Sankhya is a theistic philosophy.

Some scholars raise the objection that Sankhya-Sutra itself declares its atheistic tendencies by referring to the aphorism 'ईश्वरासिद्धे'[59]. Swami Dayananda's view is that in the aforesaid aphorism there is not the denial of the existence of God.[60] Instead, it only says that God cannot be known by sense perception. And that God is not the material cause of the universe. Hence, it is not possible to establish His existence through sense perception. At another point, elaborating upon the perpetual nature of the process of creation and destruction, Maharishi Kapil says in his introduction to the subject that apart from prakarti and purusha, there is another entity, which is different in nature from either of them.[61] What this entity is, in Maharishi Kapil's view, is explained in the immediately succeeding aphorism, and hence there is no need to indulge in a fruitless search for it. He declares in the following aphorism that this entity is the eternally free and witness Soul.[62] This characteristic can apply only to Paramatma, apart from prakrati and purusha, i.e jiva.

That Sankhya philosophy accepts God as the efficient (nimitta) cause is Dayananda's view, and this, too, is not unfounded. Sankhya clearly believes prakrati to be dependent, though this does not imply that it is not eternal. The Sankhya conception of prakrati is that it is eternal but it works under the direction and control of some power.[63] That power, which controls prakrati, is, according to the Sankhya view, omnipotent, omnipresent and the

creator of all.[64] It is reasonable also that only God can be omnipotent and the creator of all. The Sankhya-Sutra states that they accept the existence of such God who is omnipotent and the creator of all.[65] This clearly shows that according to Sankhya, Paramatma is the creator of creation. It is God who, at the beginning of creation, causes a disturbance in prakrati existing in its state of equilibrium, so that the process of creation begins. God, for the Sankhyans is neither like the God of Vishishtadvaita conception, nor like the non-dualists, who accept God as both material as well as efficient cause. In Sankhya philosophy, God is the efficient (nimitta) cause of the world, who creates the world out of the matter existing prior to the act of creation.

In addition to this, the Sankhya-Sutra propagates the concept of God at many other points also. It accepts the theory of actions and their fruits. But this theory can be justifiably held only when it is also accepted that there is some power which dispenses the fruits of actions. Actions themselves cannot generate their own fruits because in themselves, they are inert. Besides, it is often seen that the fruit comes years after the act. This also gives rise to the feeling that actions do not generate their own fruits. Maharishi Kapil also declares that "God is the dispenser of the fruits of actions. Actions themselves do not produce the fruits.[66]" Thus, Sankhya philosophy believes that God dispenses the fruits of actions.

Sankhya philosophy further believes that in salvation the purusha or jiva is established in Brahman. Its proponents state that in the states of trance, deep sleep (sushupti) and salvation, the purusha attains a state similar to that of Brahman, or in other words, the purusha is established in Brahman.[67] When the purusha is attached with the adjunct of intelligence, he begins to look upon himself as the presiding deity (adhishthata) of his body. If this adjunct disappears this relationship would also cease to exist. But the question is that even in trance, deep sleep and salvation, the identification with the adjunct of intelligence (budhisatva) still remains. In such a case, why does the purusha not consider himself the presiding deity of the body ? In answer to this, it has been argued that in the above-mentioned three states, the jiva is able to imbibe the attributes of Brahman i.e. Bliss. In a state of deep sleep, the jiva is overwhelmed by ignorance (tamas), and despite his establishment in Brahman, he remains in an almost unconscious state of ignorance. In meditation and salvation, he is

able to achieve direct perception of divine bliss.[68] In this state being intimately absorbed in Brahman, the purusha forgets all of his relations arising from the adjunct of intelligence.

Apart from these factors, Sankhya philosophers believe that the Vedas are born of Brahman's own power. On the question of the authoritativeness of these texts, the Sankhya proponents opine that the Vedas originated from the power of Brahman and that they are self-evident, and authoritative.[69] The term self-evident refers to that proof or evidence which is a proof in itself, in other words, which does not need to be proved true with the help of external facts, just as one does not need another lamp to search for the light of one lamp. Truth is self-revealed. Such perfect and indubitable knowledge can belong to no one except Brahman Himself; and, the Vedas are considered self-proved primarily because they are the expressions of this divine truth. In addition, the Vedas indulge in the elaboration of God at several places. In fact, the very purpose of the Vedas is to throw light on the nature of God. Consequently, when Sankhya philosophy accepts the Vedas as selfevident, how can it deny or even doubt the existence of God ? In our opinion, there is not even a single point in the entire range of Sankhya literature at which the existence of God has been denied.

In this way, it becomes evident to us that Sankhya philosophy propagates the concept of God as the efficient (nimitta) cause of the universe, the dispenser of fruits of actions, an entity distinct from prakrati and purusha. Going a step further, this system of thought quite explicitly declares that the final objective of purusha is the realization of Brahman. Besides, all the proofs adduced by Nyaya philosophy to establish the existence of God are also found in Sankhya philosophy. Even in the Brahma-Sutra, Brahman is accepted as the efficient cause of creation and the originator of the Vedas. Thus, by proving that Sankhya philosophy has implicit faith in God, Swami Dayananda has once again given to Sankhya its rightful place among the six systems of Vedic philosophy. He has also successfully refuted the misconceived notion that Sankhya is an atheistic system, which originated in the middle ages[70]. The consequences of this will be that the allegations levelled against this philosophy—that material prakrati and an inactive purusha or jiva cannot be the creators of the universe—will be proved baseless, and then it will be possible to accept Sankhya as a purely Vedic philosophy.

4
God

That Swami Dayananda believed in the existence of God is entirely beyond doubt. His opposition to idol-worship and the worship of numerous gods and goddesses has created the misconception that he was an atheist, but this is not correct. Not once did Swami Dayananda express the least doubt in the existence of God. For him, God is the Supreme-Entity, whom no other existing entity can either rival or overwhelm. God, in his opinion, is the creator, director and sustainer of the universe, its sole ruler. God is possessed of infinite power and infinite knowledge. He is also the agent who gives to living beings the fruits of their actions. At every point in his teachings and writings, Swami Dayananda preaches about God, a knowledge of whom can free the jiva from its cycle of birth and death and establish him in the bliss of moksha. Dayananda states that the God is refferred to by many names, which actually symbolize his various powers. On this subject, Dayananda has the profoundest respect for the views expressed in the six systems of Indian philosophical thought, and in his own philosophy, he has sought to reconcile the contradictions and differences that many scholars discover in these systems of thought. He believes that the jiva can realize God through worship and practice of Yoga.

PROOFS IN THE EXISTENCE OF GOD

What is the evidence that establishes the existence of God? This is one of the most controversial subject in philosophical literature. It is often noticed that the arguments adduced by one philosopher are altered a little and proferred by other thinkers. The majority of philosophers, both eastern and western, has offered more or less the same kind of proofs to establish the existence of God. The difference between them is primarily one of methodology, the technique adopted to propagate their respective viewpoints.

Perception as a Proof of God's existence—Materialists and the Charvaka philosophers offer the view that God cannot be known through the senses, and hence it is impossible to establish his existence through perception. Besides, in the absence of perception, inferential evidence, too, is not very significant because indirect knowledge can be inferred only on the basis of perception. Undoubtedly, God cannot be perceived by the senses like physical objects, and in consequence, all scholars seek to establish God's existence through testimony (शब्द) and inference. In opposition to this Swami Dayananda has accepted the fact of direct perception as a means to establishing the existence of God.

Question—You frequently speak of God, but how do you establish His existence ?

Dayananda (answer)—through perception and other evidences.[1] "इन्द्रियार्थ सन्निकर्षोत्पन्नं ज्ञानमव्यपदेश्यमव्यभिचारि व्यवसायात्मकं प्रत्यक्षम्" (Nyaya-Sutra 1–4) In establishing the existence of God, Swami Dayananda refers to the forementioned aphorism, which says "The knowledge that arises from the contact between ears, skin, eyes, tongue, vital energy (prana) and mind (मन) with word, touch, form or vision taste (ras), smell, pleasure, pain and true and false respectively is called perception, but it should be free of error. Now we should consider that the senses and mind provide perception of qualities, but not of their possessor, for example, the four senses skin etc. can provide knowledge of touch, vision, taste and smell, and thus the possessor of these qualities the earth, can be perceived by the mind in association of soul (atmayukta). In the same manner, such perceptible qualities as creation and design in this universe also lead to the perception of God. When the soul directs the mind and the mind directs the senses on any specific object, and when the soul turns to either evil acts such as theft or virtuous acts such as charity then his desire and cognition converge on it, at that time there arise in the soul the feelings of fear, doubt and shame for evil actions and courage, certitude and happiness for virtuous deeds. These emotions originate not in the jiva itself but are transmitted to it by God. When the jiva becomes pure and feels inspired to meditate about God, he achieves direct perception of both jiva and God." Swami Dayananda then proceeds to argue that "since knowledge of God can be had directly, there can be no doubt about knowing Him inferentially or indirectly, since the presence of the effect naturally leads to an inference of the cause."[2]

We can thus see that, at this point, Swami Dayananda establishes the existence of God through perception. The implication of his argument is that perception provides knowledge of attributes, not of their possessor itself, but on the basis of this knowledge, we infer the inherent existence of the possessor also In line with this mode of thought, the creation and organisation of the world, the eternal laws of creation, the presence of ideas such as truth, good, infinite etc , necessarily drive us to accept the existence of God or Paramatma who is their foundation or basis, since these qualities cannot exist in any entity other than God. Saint Anselm's argument about the existence of God is also similar to the preceding one. He argued that the very concept of perfection proves the existence of an entity which is perfect in itself. Although in this argument Anselm does not argue that God is the subject of direct perception. He argues that perfection is an attribute of God, and hence perfection implies a perfect being, who can only be God. Swami Dayananda's argument that perception can be a basis for knowing God places the student of philosophy, for a short while, in a strange, embarrassing position. Because as far the question of creation is concerned, it can be considered an infinite process or flow, such as atheistic systems like Jainism argue, (although this, too, is not free from flaws.). Besides, we can accept the sentiments of fear, doubt and shame on doing an evil deed as being aroused in the jiva itself, though they are contrary to the nature of the jiva. But what explanation can we offer about the concept of infinity ? Of which entity, other than God, can we conceivably attribute it ? Infinity is God's nature, and hence the awareness of infinity implies awareness of the existence of God. Descartes, the famous western philosopher, adduced the same argument to prove God's existence.

God is the creator of the Universe—Swami Dayananda seeks to establish the existence of God through the fact of the universe and its creation. In his opinion, this gigantic universe, the beginning and end of which are unknown, in which every action takes place according to definite, predetermined laws, in which every activity has some specific purpose, cannot possibly exist in the absence of an infinite, omnipotent, omniscient and supremely powerful entity.

Jain philosophers reject the need for any God in order to explain the creation of universe. In their opinion, no one created this universe, instead, it is an infinite, self-created, continuum.[3]

Swami Dayananda rejects this contention. He declares that, "the universe does not arise by its own nature, but through creation by God "[4] The reason is that "there can be no action or a thing arising as an effect in the absence of an agent. The objects like earth, which are formed by uniting and disuniting, cannot be eternal, because that which is formed by the combination of elements, did not exist before coming into being and would not exist after destruction of combination."[5] His second argument is that "if the universe arises because it is in its nature, then destruction could never occur, and if destruction is also accepted as being natural to the universe, then creation could not take place. If both these attributes are posited simultaneously, then the system of creation and destruction would become impossible"[6]

Nyaya philosophy declares God to be the efficient cause of creation. According to Nayayikas, causes are of three kinds—efficient, material and ordinary. Among these, the material cause is that which gets transformed into the effect, the efficient cause is that which does not suffer transformation itself, but changes the material from cause to effect, while the third, the ordinary causes, are the means of the efficient cause. That God is efficient cause of the universe, is the Nyaya view which Swami Dayananda accepts. This universe, which is full of infinite variety, itself stands as a proof of some supremely powerful creator. This creation appears to posses certain inviolable laws which appear to be working under the direction of some intelligent being. Swami Dayananda opines that, "the jiva does not possess the capability of creating the universe while the inert matter does not possess the capacity of becoming universe itself. This proves that it is God alone who creates this universe and remains in Bliss."[7] St. Thomas also looks upon God as the creator of the universe, though he differs from Dayananda and believes that God created the universe out of nothing. Dayananda, on the contrary, believes that God cannot create the universe out of nothing, that he creates it out of an unmanifested or potential prakrati or nature who existed prior to the act of creation. Aristotle, too, has adduced a similar argument in proving God's existence. He argues that God makes the act of creation possible by giving momentum to matter. Aristotle assumes the existence of between 47 and 55 gods.[8] But Dayananda believes that one omnipotent God has all the capabilities necessary to bring

the universe into creation. The question one is now faced with is : what was God's purpose in creating this universe ? Since Dayananda refers to God as perfect and without any desire (aptakama), one may wonder what this purpose can be. In Swami Dayananda's view, God creates this world so that jivas can experience life and achieve salvation. He does not have any personal desire or purpose in creation. Dayananda declares that God creates the entire world from his Will (ईक्षण), which is not desire, but rather "that which is the perception of all knowledge and the creation of the entire universe."[9] God does not use hands and feet in this act of creation, because it is illogical to attribute a body to Him. And, as the Upanishad says, अपाणिपादो जवनो ग्रहीता पश्यत्यचक्षुः स शृणोत्यकर्णः । स वेत्ति वेद्यं न च तस्यास्ति वेत्ता तमाहुरग्र्यं, पुरुषं महान्तम् ॥ Shvet. Up. 3·19 ॥ Exemplifying the meaning of the foregoing mantra, Dayananda says, "Paramatma does not have hands but by his power of hands He creates everything, he does not have feet but being inherent in everything He is capable of movement, He does not have eyes but sees everythings, He does not possess ears but He hears everyone's conversation, He does not have a mind or internal organ but He knows the entire universe, but there is no one who can know Him. He performs through his capacities all those acts which need senses and mind"[10]

On this the atheist wants to know when God himself is perfect bliss, why does He create this sorrowful world ? Being perfect himself, his creation. too, should have been perfect. Answering this objection, Swami Dayananda says that it is not God who by his desire creates sorrow in this world, sorrow and pleasure are in fact the outcome of the evil and virtuous deeds of jivas. Having created the universe, God merely provides a system of pleasure and pain which results from the actions of jivas. By doing so, God does not fall into any error, such as favour or disfavour. On the contrary Swami Dayananda is of the view that God performs an act of kindness by creating the universe and providing a system of rewards and punishments for jivas, and this generosity is in his nature.[11] But the jiva, because of his ignorance, gets caught in the net of his desires and indulges in evil deeds, because of which he returns to this world.

Maharishi Dayananda believes that God is formless and omnipresent. It is impossible to conceive any point of this infinite

universe in which God does not exist. God exists everywhere in this world, in the inter-steller space and sky beyond this earth, both within objects and without them. If it is assumed that God has a body, it will become necessary also to assume that He has a form, and anything that has a form cannot be omnipresent. A limited object must necessarily possess finite qualities, nature and actions, and then omnipotence cannot be attributed to it. A God of such a conception must be, suffering from all conceivable ills of attachments. He would thus become the object of the grievous criticism of atheists. **Swami Dayananda's conception of God forestalls all such difficulties and problems. Thus, we cannot argue that by creating the universe God falls from His position of omnipotence and supreme power, and becomes involved in all the defects of attachments.**

God is the distributor of the fruits of actions—Apart from the foregoing arguments, like Nyaya and other Vedic philosophies, Dayananda seeks to establish the existence of God on the basis of the system of fruits of actions perceptible in the world.[12] It is God who dispenses the fruits of actions, it is He who gives the rewards of good and bad deeds of jivas. Every action that we indulge in leaves behind its own fruit. No living being wishes to obtain sufferings, and it is seen as a tendency that no one wishes to experience pain as the retribution for his evil deeds. In such a situation, one is compelled to accept the existence of an omnipotent and supremely powerful God. Swamiji argues that if God had not existed, the jiva would not willingly have suffered pain as the reward for his sins, just as a thief does not voluntarily undergo punishment for his crime, but he undergoes it because there is a state to enforce a system of punishment. In the same way, jivas experience the fruits of their virtuous or evil deeds because there is a God to ensure this [13] However, Swamiji also points out that God does not thrust pain or pleasure on any jiva at his own. A jiva gets pleasure and pain according to his deeds, though it is God who dispenses either of them. In this way, Swami Dayananda also refutes the criticism that God can wilfully give pleasure or pain to anyone. In his view, God is completely free from prejudice in the distribution of the fruits of the jiva's actions. Yamunacharya, too, accepts the validity of these arguments in establishing the existence of God.[14]

God is the first source of knowledge—Dayananda holds that God is the first or original source of all knowledge, and points out that, at the beginning of creation, God enlightens the human race with the knowledge of the Vedas for a successful life. Like other Vedic thinkers, Dayananda also believes that the Vedas are texts of divine knowledge. In support of this view, he argues that savages do not become learned by mere observing the creation but they achieve this status when they get a teacher. Even today, no one can become learned without being taught by a teacher.[15] And this contention is entirely tenable. In the absence of basic knowledge, the consciousness of jiva is limited to the power of knowledge, which cannot comprehend the mystery of creation without an efficient and guiding knowledge. It is in this form that Yoga conceives of God as the first teacher (guru) or guide.[16] Thus, this also proves the existence of God. In addition, the Vedas also contain descriptions of God, and thus there is literal proof also. In opposition to thus, it can be argued that since you prove the existence of God through the Vedas and that of Vedas through God, you indulge in interdependent reasoning, which cannot prove the existence of either Swami Dayananda's answer to this is that "we believe that the qualities, action and nature of God are eternal, and eternals cannot suffer from the defect of being mutually interdependent". He then adds, "since Parameshwar Himself and His infinite qualities such as knowledge, are eternal, the Vedas, which are a creation of God, cannot suffer from the defect of infinite regress (anavastha dosh)."[17] This argument, too, is above criticism since the defect of infinite regress cannot exist when the two eternal substances are related to each other as attributes and the attributed. The Paramatma is omniscient, and one minute part of his omniscient knowledge has been published in the Vedas. This cannot undermine the value of God in the face of the Vedas.

In this way, Swami Dayananda presents the old Vedic proofs of God's existence in a new light, and in this his constant endeavour is to propagate truth at the highest intellectual level.

THE NATURE OF GOD

"God is of the nature of truth, bliss and consciousness, formless, supremely powerful, just, generous, unborn, infinite, without blemish and distortion, unique (*anupama*), the basis of everything, master of all (*sarveishwar*), omnipresent, residing in all thing (*sarvaantaryami*),

unperishable (*ajar*), beyond death, fearless, eternal, pure, and the creator of the universe. It is proper to worship Him and no other." (The second commandment of Arya Samaj, laid down by Swami Dayananda)

The three words Ishwara, Paramatma and Brahman are used by Swami Dayananda to refer to the sole being who possesses the above-mentioned attributes.

What is the conception of God according to Swami Dayananda is apparent from the second commandment that he framed for the Arya Samaj. For him, God is the highest entity which he also calls Brahman, Paramatma, and the Param-Purusha. In his absence the origin of creation, sustenance, destruction and the Law of Karma, are all inconceivable. Swami Dayananda's views on this differ significantly from the preceding philosophers like Shankaracharya, Ramanuja, Vallabh and Madhva. How a realistic system of thought should conceive of God is best discovered to us by the philosophy of Swami Dayananda. However, this does not imply that he was opposed to the viewpoints of the Vedas and the Upanishads. He declares at many places in his compositions that he (Dayananda) treats not only the Vedas but also the eleven main Upanishads as being revealed and therefore authoritative.[18] Not merely this, he states explicitly that the Upanishads are realistic, and that the description of God provided in them is founded in a realistic viewpoint.

One may like to discover the 'ism' of western philosophy and philosophical language with which Swami Dayananda's conception of God bears resemblance—theism, deism, pantheism or panentheism. It is our opinion that it is unreasonable and illogical to try to adapt both eastern and western philosophical thinking into the same linguistic mould. This is all the more so because of the differences of viewpoint, culture, civilization and even modes of thought, which exist between the East and the West. It is, of course, very true that at certain points we do come across astonishing similarities between the two angles of vision, but despite this, there are very wide-ranging differences And it has often been observed that exact linguistic equivalents are not discoverable. Scholars in particular seem bent upon fitting Indian systems of thought into western terminology because of which these systems suffer grievous misrepresentation. It is because of this that scholars harbour grave misconceptions about Indian philosophy. In the

same way, any attempt to express the views of Swami Dayananda in western terms could change and even distort his real intention.

For Dayananda, Ishwar and Brahman are synonyms referring to the same entity. The word Brahman is established from the roots 'बृह', 'ब्रह्', and 'बृद्धौ'. It means, ' that which is omnipresent, great, infinite and supremely powerful". The word Brahman has been used to refer to the Supreme Being both in the Upanishads and the Vedas. There, too, God, being great, has been called Brahman. In the Vedas and Upanishads, the main name attributed to God is Om.[19] The Upanishads state, ' Of whom all the Vedas sing, whom all the seers elaborate upon, the desire to realize whom inspires all the seekers after salvation to adopt Brahmacharya, He, briefly stated, is Om."[20] Om is the main name of God, while the other names may also refer to any other substance possessing the qualities signified by those names. In the entire Vedic literature, the word Om has been used exclusively to refer to God only. All His other names are treated as qualitative. Swami Dayananda elaborates upon this name Om in the following manner : "The word Om is the highest name of Paramatma because the three letters that go into its composition अ, उ, म् (A, U, M) and create a unity, as ओइम् (*OM*). This refers to many other names of God, such as the letter अ (*A*) refers to विराट् (*Great*), अग्नि (*Power of Fire*) and विश्वादि (*Various creations*) उ (U) refers to हिरण्यगर्भ (*matrix of origin*), वायु (*Subtle Air*), तैजस (*Luminous*) and म् (*M*) refers to ईश्वर (*God*), आदित्य (*Refulgence*) and प्राज्ञ (*Knowledge*) etc.[21]

In the first chapter of his "Satyartha Prakash", Dayananda elaborates upon more than one hundred names ascribed to God. God is also called "*Agni*", or fire, because He enlightens everything. The same God, being the highest entity, is called "*Indra*", too, and since he is the basis of the life of everything, he is also "*Prana*", which means life. And, since he is creator of everything, He is also called *Brahma*. Since His attributes are infinite, His names are also innumerable. In elaborating thus, Swami Dayananda propagates the same philosophy of the Vedas which declares that Paramatma possesses all the qualities and powers.[22]

God is *eternal*. If we refute this view, we must assume that He is born, and since everything that is born must also die, God would be subject to the same condition. Anything that is born and must die cannot be supremely powerful because he must be

dependent upon some other entity for his own existence. Besides, a substance that is born can achieve progress and growth, but he cannot achieve infinite growth. Thus, if God is not conceived of as eternal, He also cannot be believed to be supremely powerful. Maharishi Dayananda explains that the entity which is causeless and is not restricted by time can be considered eternal, and thus Paramatma, being beyond space and time, is eternal. He is infinite, because nothing can limit Him. The Bible declares that God lives in Heaven. The Deistic conception is also quite similar in that it says that God creates this world and then departs from it, which logically implies that God is not all pervading and that He possesses a body. In Swami Dayananda's opinion such conceptions are no better than childish prattle.

God is *All-Powerful.* This means that God is omnipotent, that there is no other entity equal or superior to Him. God is He who rules over everyone and everything. Many philosophers interpret the term omnipotent to mean that God can do anything that He wishes. He can create the universe out of nothing, He can give sweet fruit for evil deeds, etc. But Dayananda rejects this view and argues that omnipotence does not mean that God can do as He wishes. This term means that He does not need the assistance of any other entity in creation, sustenance and destruction of the universe. If the earlier assumption is held, does it not clearly imply that God can act prejudicially ? Whatever the act, and whoever indulges in it, whether it be God or the jiva, cannot occur in violation of the law of causality. At this point, Dayananda ventures the question : Can God do the impossible? Can He create another God or achieve death for Himself ? Can He be unjust, impure and the agent of evil deeds ? These things are inconceivable because even God cannot go contrary to natural laws[23]. Swami Dayananda explains further : "the laws of Ishwara are perfect, true and eternal, therefore, (even He) cannot bring any change in them[24]." The Christian theologian St. Thomas, too, has similarly declared that God cannot destroy the past, commit a sin and destroy His own existence to bring into existence another God[25]. Russell argues that according to St. Thomas God possesses all positive virtues, while all evil attributes, such as anger, forgetfulness, hatred and sorrow, are completely lacking in Him[26]. Here, we find an astonishing similarity between the views of Swami Dayananda and St. Thomas. Sometimes great scholars and thinkers

think alike and their conclusions are especially identical when they abandon prejudice in their search for the truth. Plato also holds the view that God cannot utter a falsehood, that He cannot indulge in any activity which is opposed to his virtuous attributes[27]. And, this is very convincing. It is impossible for us to conceive of the Supreme Being as involved in unnatural acts, because to imagine this would be to nullify the difference between Him and ourselves.

Dayananda believes Brahman to be *Formless.* The concept of formlessness applies to that which is inherent everywhere and which has no concrete form. Shankaracharya also holds Brahman to be formless, but he simultaneously propagates the view that the jiva is a reflection of the Brahman in conscience (अन्त:करण). Objecting to this view Swami Dayananda adduces the argument that only objects which have form have a shadow or a reflection, as the face can be seen reflected in a mirror because it has a form. Since Brahman is formless, so there cannot be any reflection of Him[28]. If it is argued that the formless sky finds a reflection in clear water, then Swamiji answers that the reflection seen in water is not of the sky but this is the reflection of minute particles of earth, water and fire which have collected in space. The sky pervades everything and hence it cannot have any reflection. God, being formless, also is all-pervasive. If He had not been so, such qualities as omniscience, etc., could not exist in Him because a finite object has finite qualities, actions and nature[29]". In view of this, it is impossible to conceive of God as having form and being temporal. The formless and all-pervasive God, creates the world out of prakrati which is most subtle. He is *omniscient*, which means that He knows everything. In comparison to the jiva He can be called the knower of past, present and future, other-wise there is no such knowledge which existed in God before and do not exist afterward. His knowledge is indivisible, infinite and real while the jiva's is finite. The jiva soon forgets the past, he has no knowledge of the future, but this is not the case with God. On the contrary, God is aware of the actions voluntarily done by the jivas[30]. The fact that God knows the actions that a jiva may commit in the future implies that the jiva's future is pre-determined. God is aware of the future actions of jiva and this implies that freedom of action is denied to the jiva. It appears contradictory to believe that the jiva is free in his actions and also to believe that God knows in advance the

future actions of the jiva. But such a doubt does not arise in Dayananda's philosophy. He declares that God has knowledge of the jiva's actions as these are done and God grants the jiva the fruits of those actions. But the jiva is also free to a certain degree in his choice of actions.

Another issue that arises with reference to God's omniscient is that being omniscient, God must also be aware of His own end. If it is said in answer that being omniscient, He must be aware of this, it would imply that God has an end, that He is not infinite. On the other hand, if it is insisted that God is infinite and does not know His own end, this contention violates His omniscience. Swami Dayananda answers this question like a brilliant logician and says that God knows Himself to be infinite[31]. This completely annihilates the argument of objector.

Ancient Greek philosopher Democritus held that the cause of the world is the atom, though he ignored the question how the lifeless atoms became active. Possibly, he neglected this aspect because he would have had to assume a prime mover to bring activity in the atoms. The Jain refutation of God as the creator of the universe is even more pungent than that of Democritus. Scholars who accept the atomistic view believe that creation is purposeless and that scientific research and analysis can be carried on with greater facility by presuming purposelessness[32] But it is gravely erroneous on the part of such scholars to hold such a view. It appears that such scholars are afraid that accepting the existence of God and attributing a purpose to creation, may undermine the importance of physical materials and hence they commit this error, because some theistic scholars hold the view that God can create the universe even in the absence of matter. Any such objection is untenable in the face of Swami Dayananda's philosophy because he believes that along with God, prakrati, too, exists eternally. While he is critical of the Neo-Vedantists (the term comprehends Shankaracharya and his disciples) on the one hand in arguing that Brahman cannot create the universe without prakrati, on the other hand, he is also equally critical of Jain thinkers and materialists when he says that non-living matter cannot by itself give rise to creation without a creator. Consequently, he concludes that there must be some supremely powerful entity which gives rise to this infinitely varied universe.

God is the most subtle of all material entities of the world, and because of this, He pervades them all. He inheres in the jiva as well as all the elements of prakrati. Being all-pervasive, He is the most extensive (*vrahada*). Dayananda holds that it is because of His all-pervasiveness that He is also omnipresent, omniscient, the supreme creator and controller of all. If He were limited to any one dimension or direction, He could not possibly have possessed these attributes[33]. One major objection commonly raised against dualism is that two substances cannot subsist in one place, and hence no other substance can co-exist with God. If such co-existence is presumed, the infinitude of Paramatma is circumscribed and He is rendered finite, because wherever the other substance exists, God would thereby be excluded. No such objection can possibly be raised against Swami Dayananda's philosophy because in his view, being extremely subtle, God inheres in and pervades every substance just as fire is inherent in hot iron. This view does not limit God's existence. God is the efficient cause of the world. He creates the universe out of the eternal prakrati through His infinite knowledge. He does not suffer distortion and assume the form of the universe. Neither does He come under the influence of maya and cast reflection in ignorance. God creates the universe out of pure generosity so that jiva may be able to have experiences and rise to reform. He has no selfish purpose in creation. The sole purpose of creation is the experience of the jiva and salvation of it. One may now raise the question : If God has no purpose in creation, then why does He create the universe and become involved in this phenomenal world ? Swami Dayananda answers that God by creating the world, does not fall into any sorrow and involve Himself into this phenomena, because He is perfect[34]. Pleasure and pain bear relationship to the deeds of the jiva.

Shankaracharya declares Brahman to be the both efficient and material cause of the universe but Dayananda believes God to be only its efficient cause. Dayananda could find nothing satisfactory in the monism of Shankaracharya because its basic doubt, as to why the attributeless God became distorted into a universe of attributes, remains unresolved. What the purpose of God is in creating this universe, remains unanswered in these philosophies, because it is natural to presume that if God is the only substance, then He must have created the universe for some purpose of His

own. Some of the later Vedantists as well as Ramanuja opine that the universe is God's play *(leela)*[35]. Nevertheless, one may well ask why God should have chosen to indulge in a game through which He divided Himself from one into many ? The Vishishtadvaita of Ramanuja suffers from the error that it implies that God created this varied universe and thus spread a vast web of pleasure and pain; does God derives pleasure from the sufferings of jivas ? Any such conception gives a distorted conception of God and also brings a charge of His being involved in attachment and aversion against Him. In contrast, Dayananda's conception of God as the efficient cause is free from any such error.

God is both with and without attributes (सगुण व निर्गुण)—The Brahmanist thinkers believe that God is without attributes, and that no attributes can be attributed to Him But in their view, Brahman becomes Ishwara due to the adjunct of maya and thus assumes the status of a God with attributes. We have already indicated that Swamiji completely rejects the conception of two Brahman i. e. upper and lower Brahman. In his view, there is one single Supreme Being, which is both with and without attributes. Swami Dayananda says—"that which is possessed of attributes is called *Sagun*, while that which is devoid of attributes is called *nirgun*. All objects are of these two kinds since they possess their own natural attributes while they lack all the attributes of their natural opposites. There is no entity or thing which can either be called only with attributes or attributeless. In reality, the condition of possessing attributes and also lacking them exists simultaneously. In the same manner, God possesses such attributes as omniscience, supreme power, etc., but at the same time, He also lacks such negative qualities as form (characteristic of matter) and aversion etc. (characteristic of jiva), in Him and hence it can be said that He is without attributes[36]." The conception of Brahman placed before us by Shankaracharya is such that it is impossible even to think of it, to say nothing of worshipping it. A successful and appropriate metaphysics must be able to bring to the common man a conception of a supreme entity which can be the repository of his faith and worship. **Consequently, Swami Dayananda declares that Brahman is both with and without attributes. The worshipper can worship God on the basis of His natural, innate attributes, but it is not possible to attribute to Him impossible qualities which are contrary to His very nature, and hence He can be conceived of as being without attributes.**

A very common but fallacious assumption on the part of many scholars is that by the presence of attributes they ascribe form to God, while their absence implies formlessness But formless element can also possess attributes, for instance, the sky, whose attribute is sound (*shabda*). Besides, since formlessness is itself a quality, how can such a substance be considered attributeless ? God being ubiquitous is *Formless* and Dayananda ordains that only this single *Formless* Paramatma must be worshipped[37]. In Shankaracharya's philosophy, the object of worship is Ishwara i. e. Lower Brahman. Ramanujacharaya insists on the worship of Vishnu, a conception which implicitly accepts the worship of a Supreme Being but who has a distinct form. As against this, Swami Dayananda proposes the direct worship of one Brahman, who does not have an inferior form akin to Shankaracharya's conception of Ishwara, and nor does He have a form similar to that of Ramanuja's conception. Further, Dayananda does not accept that there can be any idol of Brahman who is formless. Neither the Vedas nor the Upanishadas ordain the worship of an idol. The Vedas clearly decry idol worship, saying that there can be no idol of God[38] On this same basis, Swami Dayananda states that "when God is without form, it is impossible to create an idol of Him[39] " Consequently, the Swamiji's conception of God's worship rejects idol worship.

Dayananda says that God is Truth, Bliss and Consciousness (Satchidananda) – According to his interpretation, God is *Truth* because He pervades all substances that have existence, God is *Consciousness* because He is aware of both true and false and because He arouses the knowledge in the mind of all living beings, and God is *Bliss* both because it is His nature and also because He is far beyond sorrows and sufferings. Besides, all jivas find bliss with Him in the state of moksha. Hence He is *Bliss*[40].

Dayananda further believes Paramatma to be *Unique*. Some scholars argue that very concept of uniqueness implies non-dualism. But Dayananda's philosophy is traitvad. According to him God is unique because He is uncompared *(anupama)*. Nothing is either bigger than or equal to Him. Jiva and Prakrati eternally exist along with Paramatma, but both are inferior to Him. This conception does not contradict God's all-pervasiveness because God, being supremely subtle inheres in both the jiva and prakrati[41].

God is the *source of Bliss*. Dayananda says "that one, whose ignorance has disappeared by deep meditation and who has established his mind in God gets inexplicable Happiness by getting union with God. Jiva experiences this Happiness in his mind or internal organ[12]." Prayer and worship of God improve the qualities, deeds and nature of the jiva. Christianity and other sects popularly believe that God forgives the sins of His worshippers, but Dayananda believes that God does not forgive the evil deeds of even His most devout worshippers[13]. Faced by such a contention, we may well ask: then why should we worship God ? Dayananda's answer is "that worship of God leads to attachment with Him, the individual's own qualities, deeds and nature improve through contact with Him, the individual obtains fearlessness, egolessness, courage and aid. Worship of Brahman leads to direct union with God[14]." Realization of God occurs in a state of trance-like meditation when the jiva comes in contact of God. God cannot be realized through the senses because these have been created for obtaining knowledge of gross objects. It is beyond their power to obtain knowledge of subtle entities. God is the subtlest of all entities, and hence He cannot be realized through the senses.

God does not incarnate Himself - A very commonly held view in Hindu religion is that whenever evil deeds, sorrow and sufferings grow to excess in this world, God Himself assumes a concrete form through incarnation and visits the world to rid it of these evils. This imagination of incarnation appears very charming, because it gives comfort in the view that God assumes human form and joins the human race. In Islam, it is held that God sends his messengers to the earth to remove blaspheme, while the Christians believe that the son of God descended on earth in the desert of west Asia when He was moved by the sufferings of the human race. In contrast, Swami Dayananda's philosophy is rational. Consequently, it cannot allow any cotradictions to creep in. He questions the theory of incarnation by asking; whether God has any need to assume a human form ? Can the omnipotent God not destroy evil doers through a mere act of will ? Dayananda contends that, in the first place, there is no need for God to incarnate Himself since the Paramatma, who could create this entire universe without assuming a human form, can certainly destroy all evil forces through a simple act of will[15]. Secondly, how can the infinite, formless, omnipresent, and omniscient God enter the uterus of a

woman ? Did He not already exist there, that we should presume that He enters it ? God is beyond all physical bonds: then how can He assume a human body[46] ?" Consequently, **Swami Dayananda voices his conviction that God does not assume human form or appear as an incarnation.** Secondly, Dayananda also refutes the Islamic contention that God sends His messenger to earth because he believes that God has no messengers. At the very beginning of creation, God placed all knowledge for the benefit of mankind in the conscience of four seers. Besides, any individual who renounces the path of evil and treads the path of dharma, **who devotes his life to the emancipation of the human race, is the messenger of God on earth. Any individual who obeys God's injunctions and indulges in virtuous actions and thus seeks to mould himself according to the attributes of God, is the true son of God. Dayananda refuses to accept any particular individual as the son of God, because he believes that all human beings are the children of God.**

Criticism of the Jain philosophy—Jain philosophy rejects the existence of any such God who creates the universe, but it gives to its Tirthankaras the position of God. These Tirthankaras occupy the same place as God when they achieve salvation[47]. Dayananda's argument against such a view is that, in the first place, "anyone, who first possesses such shortcomings as attachment etc., and afterwards achieves freedom or salvation from them, can never become God, because due to whieh virtues, he has attained freedom from all such errors, will come to end on the exhaustion of the power of those virtues, therefore, their freedom is temporary. Secondly that which is finite and of finite knowledge can never become omnipresent and omniscient. The very nature of the jiva is that it exists in one place and is of limited attributes, actions and nature. Hence it can never become the knower of all real knowledge. Hence, your Tirthankaras can never become God[48]. An individual possessing limited power can extend his power to a certain extent, but it cannot become infinite.

In this way, we can observe that the various objections that are raised regarding the existence, nature, form and works of God are rationally refuted in the philosophy of Swami Dayananda.

MONISM AND POLYTHEISM

The question whether there is one God or many has been reflected upon by innumerable scholars in their own individual ways.

Even in mediaeval times, when polytheistic concept was more popular and prevalent, the monotheistic idea was also not absent. According to Polytheism, apart from the God who is creator and sustainer of the universe, there are numerous other gods and goddesses who also are objects of worship. In one of its many forms, polytheism also envisages ghosts and witches, and separate gods in the separate substances of the universe, including such objects as trees, mountains, rivers, clouds, etc. Worship of a dead person can also be considered one form of it. On the other hand, monotheism holds that God is the one, the supreme power, the sole creator of the universe, and the focal point of our worship. Apart from Him, the various objects of nature and creation such as air, fire, clouds, rain, trees, etc., are not worthy of worship and hence not gods. Instead, all these are the varied manifestations of nature, they are not conscious powers which can rule over mankind. In fact, they are merely the various effects of prakrati brought into existence by the power and inspiration of God. Hence, none of them is worthy of worship.

Swami Dayananda was a monist, totally untouched by even the shadow of polytheism. He states positively, "you must accept only Him the creator, and none other has brought into light and existence this varied universe, who sustains and destroys it, who is the sole owner of it, in whom the creation and destruction of the universe inheres. He is Paramatma [9]. Swami Dayananda ordains that this Paramatma is to be worshipped. He states, "Worship with love that Paramatma who has created the universe from the earth to the sun[50]." Not only this, even the Shruti has clearly refuted the worship of various gods and goddesses in its statement. "The word 'devta' or deva is attributed to that who possesses useful and good qualities, and the earth is one such object, but nowhere is it said to be God or worthy of worship[51]."

When Swami Dayananda was propagating his own system of thought, in India polytheism was prevalent. But contrary to the common view, Swami Dayananda had established his theory that there is only one Paramatma, irrespective of whether He is called Brahman or Ishwara. It is most improper to worship any being other than Him. Since Dayananda believed that the Vedas contain true knowledge, a belief which he shared with the entire Hindu race, he successfully proved from the mantras of the Vedas that there is only one God. Only a short time before Swami

Dayananda, Raja Ram Mohan Roy, too, had made a similar attempt to establish monotheism in Hindu religion. (For an analysis of monotheism in the Vedas, please see page 11, the section entitled Polytheism—Henotheism and Monotheism).

Puranic literature is filled with belief in many devas (gods) and it clarifies that all of them are equal to God. These devas (gods) have a direct influence in creation and when they are overjoyed by the worship of their devotees, they are ready to do anything for them. It is because of such flights of fancy that various sects have arisen in Hindu religion. Among these, each god is the supreme. The Vaishnavas, for instance, believe Vishnu to be the supreme deity, while the Shaktas worship only Lord Shiva. What is even worse, members of one sect often lose no opportunity to launch bitter and virulent attacks on members of other sects. **It is our opinion that if Max Mueller had talked of Henotheism with reference to Puranic deism instead of Vedic theism, it would have been more appropriate. There is no trace of henotheisn in the Vedas, but it certainly exists in the Puranas.**

Swami Dayananda has declared the polytheism described in the Puranas as contrary to both rational acceptance and Vedic religion. For him, the Vedas alone are authoritative. Consequently, he established the monotheism of the Vedas beyond doubt, and thus totally refuted both the Indian and western Vedic commentaries which concentrated on ritualism or adopted a naturalistic stand[52].

He is of the view that the word 'deva' should not be interpreted to mean God[53]. Instead, it should be interpreted according to Nirukta[54]. When this is done, the word can be attributed to anything which promotes welfare and well-being, be it conscious or material. But no where in Vedic texts these objects have been ordained of being worthy of worship. In this contention, Swami Dayananda appears to be more logical.

More than ample evidence of the monotheistic viewpoint of Swamiji can be discovered in the Upanishadas, which consider Brahman alone as the supreme entity of the universe, and also declare that, "That which the mind cannot see but by the power of which the mind sees, He is that, only know Him Brahman, and not that which is worshipped with reference to this"[55]. According to the Shatpath Brahman, whoever worships material devtas apart from Brahman is like an animal[56].

In his work entitled "Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics," Sir Joseph Royce has written a chapter on monotheism and in it he has included the principle of maya or illusion as being an integral part of Hindu monotheism. He has taken it as Indian monotheism. According to mayavad, Brahman alone is true while all other entities are mere illusion. Although this scholar uses the term acosmism for this viewpoint, he has considered Shankara's theory of maya as representative of all Vedic philosophies and included it in Hindu monotheism because it influenced Spinoza's philosophy in Europe while it appeared as Neo-Platonism in Greek philosophy[57]. Such a view is patently erroneous because Nyaya, Vaisheshika and Yoga are all monotheistic systems of thought, but they do not bear the least imprint of the principle of maya. It appears reasonable to assume that the learned scholar made no attempt to understand them at all. Besides, the question whether Shankara's view has any foundation in Upanishadas or not is in-itself a controversial issue (this we have discussed in second chapter of this book). Hence we demand to know why the entire expanse of Hindu monotheism should be moulded in the frame of the theory of maya. On this subject, the learned scholar can be said to have made a grave error.

Monotheism and Pantheism—In addition to this, some scholars identify monotheism with pantheism, but this can never be considered rational. It is possible that a system of thought can be monotheistic but not pantheistic. If we consider Nyaya, Vaisheshika and Yoga, we find that they are all monotheistic, but because they believe that prakrati and purusha are also eternal, they cannot thus be dubbed pantheistic. Swami Dayananda also accepts the view that along with Brahman, prakrati and jiva are eternal and infinite. He is monotheist but not pantheist.

From the foregoing description it is now clear that Dayananda is a monotheist. He does not believe that there is any other God, or that any material power or deva can be assumed to rule over the various parts of the universe. He also refutes the gods and goddesses of Greek mythology as well as Puranic mythology who have a human form but are superior to men and live in the sky or other regions, and who fight among each other for women, just as mortal men do. Swami Dayananda's philosophy and religion has no place for such nonsensical flights of fancy. The view that there is a need for a number of gods to

direct the functioning of the universe despite the existence of Brahman, is completely unacceptable to the philosophical mind. The omnipotent and omnipresent Brahman is fully capable of controlling and directing the universe. He has no need of other agencies. It is only in this sense that the term 'omnipotent' has any real meaning[58]. On this issue, Swami Dayananda's view is perfectly philosophical. It is not as barran and dissatisfying as Shankara's concept of a Brahman without attributes, nor as impractical as Spinoza's concept of the Absolute. On the one hand, it possesses the profundity of philosophy, and on the other, a true practicality. It is impossible to conceive of Shankara's Brahman without attributes as being the object of our worship, but the Brahman of Dayananda's conception can be worshipped, since all divine qualities can be attributed to Him.

Consideration of Shankara's and Ramanuja's views

Analysis of Shankara's philosophy – According to Acharya Shankara Brahman is an entity without attributes. He opines that qualities cannot be attributed to Brahman because any such attempt implies creating of relationships, but nothing can have relationship with Brahman. The pure Brahman is an entity without attributes and relations. Brahman is referred to as "Sat-chit-ananda". When we say that Brahman is "Sat", we mean that He is not untrue, when He is called "Chit", it means that He is not unconscious and when we speak of Brahman as "Ananda", we mean that Brahman is beyond sorrow. But even Sat-chit anand cannot describe Brahman comprehensively, since in fact Brahman is beyond description. He is the basis of everything, but He is not a substance. He is beyond time and space and yet He exists in all times and every where. He is not the cause of anything. He bears no relationship with anything. He cannot be described through words, because He is infinite. He has no form because He is formless. Shankara has described Brahman by using the words "not this, not this", but this does not mean the negation of Brahman. Instead, it hints at the nature of this supreme entity which is beyond description and even beyond conception.

If Brahman is accepted as the sole entity, then what is the status of this world ? The Acharaya says that the world is an imposition in Brahman, just as an imposition of silver in shell. Ishwara

is the reflection of the pure Brahman in maya. Ishwara is both material and efficient cause of the world, its determiner, the dispenser of fruits of actions, and the creator of this world of name and form. In Shankara's conception, Brahman is devoid of attributes, while Ishwara possesses attributes. The jiva, according to this philosophy, is also an impositions by ignorance in Brahman, and it is the jiva who assumes bodies in this illusory world. Shankara does not believe in the existence of prakrati, but he suggests that it is established in Brahman by the jiva due to his ignorance. Though Brahman is the substratum, still it is distinct from Brahman and it is because of this that Shankara conceives of Brahman as the material as well as efficient cause of the world. Briefly, then, Shankara conceives of Brahman as being inactive and without attributes, and assumes that he has two forms, the upper and the lower Brahman The world is an illusion (adhyaasya) while the jiva exists because of ignorance.

Swami Dayananda finds it impossible to accept this highly sophisticated system of thought, because in his opinion, it does not find support in either the Vedas or the Upanishads. In the Upanishads, the word "unique" has been used for Brahman, but it means that which has no equal or superior. Dayananda's view is that when the Upanishads refer to Brahman as "सदैव सोम्येदमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्" (Ch. U. 6. 2. 1) they imply that Brahman is unique, that there is no other entity equal to Brahman. But this does not even implicitly argue the non-existence of the jiva and prakrati. All that it means is that Brahman is supreme, that He is omnipotent, that no other entity is equal or superior to Him. It is nowhere stated in this mantra that there do not exist any entities inferior to Brahman[59]. Yamunacharya also refutes the Advaita of Shankara in an identical manner at Upanishadic level[60]. Brahman cannot be accepted as completely attributeless because it is impossible to conceive of a Brahman who is devoid of all attributes. With such a conception, worship of God would become an impossibility. The act of thinking about or meditating upon any entity involves considering its attributes. Maharishi Dayananda adduces the argument that Brahman is both with and without attributes. He explains that the attributes like forms exist in inert matter while the attributes like knowledge exist only in consciousness and not in any inert

substance, and in the same way consciousness possesses the attribute of desire which non-living matter does not. It means that which has attributes is with attributes (सगुण) while that which lacks attributes is attributeless (निर्गुण). All substances possess their own attributes and lack those which contradict such attributes, and consequently they can be said to be with and without attributes (सगुण व निर्गुण) simultaneously. "There is no substance in the world which either be with attributes only or be attributeless. Instead, the presence and absence of attributes coexists. In the same way, Parameshwar is said to be possessed of attributes because He possesses omniscience, omnipotence and other such attributes, but He is also said to be attributeless because He lacks the form of material substances and the attachment, jealousy, etc., of the jiva[61].' If Brahman is conceived of as completely attribute'ess, it is impossible even to think about Him. How can such a Brahman then be the object of our worship ?

Swami Dayananda also rejects Shankaracharya's conception of two Brahmans, because Dayananda holds that Ishwara is another name for Brahman. If the proponents of the principle of maya argue that the existence of Ishwara can be established through an adjunct of maya (mayopadhi), Dayananda raises an objection in the form of a question : If this is so, then who is influenced by maya and comes under its adjunct ? Is it Brahman ? If the answer is positive, it would mean that Brahman is influenced by maya and that also from infinity in time because both maya and Brahman are infinite, which further implies that Brahman has been under the influence of maya from eternity. The Advaita Vedantists believe that there are six eternal entities (1) jiva (2) Ishwara (3) Brahman (4) the distinction between jiva and Ishwara (5) ignorance or false knowledge, (6) the union between ignorance and consciousness[62]. Objecting to this, Dayananda declares that "In your system, jiva cannot be established without union with ignorance, and Ishwara cannot be established without union with maya. As a result, the sixth entity accepted by you fails to exist because ignorance-maya is in the contex of jiva and Ishwara. Besides, Ishwara cannot be established without the union between Brahman, maya and ignorance, and hence it is pointless to consider Ishwara as distinct from ignorance (maya) and Brahman. Hence, your system can establish the existence of

only two entities, Brahman and ignorance, and not six"[63]. Swami Dayananda goes on to argue that it is wrong to accept the existence of Ishwara in Brahman on account of His being the cause, and the jiva which is designated the effect because any such inference would negate the concept of infinite, pure, intelligent and free Brahman, it will become necessary to posit the existence of ignorance in the omnipotent, omniscient Brahman. Vedantists have sought to overcome this objection by calling it maya. But what precisely is that maya, and in what does it subsist ? Such questions are raised by Swami Dayananda, as they were raised by other scholars. Neo-Vedantists have failed to provide satisfactory answers to such questions. All that they can do is to avoid the question by referring to maya whose character is very amusing, it is sometimes true, sometimes false and sometimes indeterminable. Thus implying that they can offer no satisfactory definition of the concept of maya. In fact, in Shankara's philosophy, maya is not distinguishable from ignorance, and in that case it becomes necessary to assume that maya either exists in Brahman or is His power, which the Vedantists have accepted. But such an addmission completely undermines the purity of Brahman, and the fact of his being devoid of attributes. Some Vedantist thinkers conceive of maya as prakrati which is possessed of three attributes. But how such a notion is in consonance with the notion of Brahman as the sole entity is beyond rational explanation. To make such a conception tenable, it becomes necessary to accept Brahman and prakrati as eternal, and this would inevitably shake the very foundations of Shankara's philosophy.

It appears that Shankaracharya would have assumed the concept of two levels of existence—the phenomenal and transcen dental—because of such intricate problems i. e. existence of the world, its creation, existence of jiva, his actions and their fruits. Without accepting the practical level, it is impossible to offer a satisfactory explanation of the world of perception, and all the myriad activities that occur in it. However, according to Shankara's philosophy, nothing exists at the transcendental level except Brahman. Elucidating the futility of the world, the scholarly composer of the Mandukya-karika and Shankara's great grand teacher, Sri Gaudapada explains that actually "there is no creation of the world, neither is there any destruction, there is no

free soul and neither is there any soul in bondage[64]". Shankaracharya might have conceived two levels of existence i. e. phenomenal and transcendental, only to satisfy the average intellect. In mayavad the focus of worship is the Iswhara of phenomenal level, since He is conceived of as the creator of the world as well as being possessed of attributes. But Jayatirtha like Swami Dayananda declares that "the two forms of Brahman are not established since there is no proof of it[65]". Moreover, we do not find any trace of the theory of two Brahmans either in Upanishads or six systems. Upanishads clearly say 'एकमेवाद्वितीयम्' implying that there is one Brahman not two, (Ch. U. 6. 2/I). Max Mueller also opines that Upanishadic literature provides no trace of any theory which validates the conception of two Brahmans[66].

In Shankara's philosophy, Brahman becomes jiva due to the adjunct of ignorance. The is the reflection of Brahman in ignorance. Swami Dayananda's comment on this is that "only a body with form can be reflected in a medium which itself has form, just as the human face and the mirror are two distinct entities possessing forms. If the two are not distinct, a reflection can not come to exist[67]." If it is argued that the jiva comes to exist because of internal organ (अन्तःकरणोपाधि). Swami Dayananda argues that the Brahman established in internal organ should possess the attributes of omniscience etc., but the jiva is a possessor of limited knowledge. From this, it can reasonably be inferred that the Brahman becomes jiva through ignorance, and such a notion ridicules the concept of Brahman as being omniscient. **These arguments of Swami Dayananda are definitely sound and weighty. It is impossible to sovle the riddle of the one and the many on the basis of non-dualism or Advaita. Besides, maya is another major riddle in this philosophy, which is beyond explanation. It posits that the world is an illusion despite its existence and that the jiva is the ingorant Brahman, an illusion in an illusory world.**

Criticism of Ramanuja – Acharya Ramanuja propounds the theory of Vishishtadvaita in opposition to the doubt-ridden Advaita concept of Shankaracharya. In this philosophy, the relation of Brahman, jiva and prakrati has been posited like the relation in between the body and its occupier soul. Just as the body and the soul inhabiting it are considered one, though they are distinct. Jiva is only a part of Brahman in the form of adjective (visheshana). Though the attributes of the jiva differ from those

of Ishwara and both are eternal, but the jiva can not exist apart from Brahman. In this philosophy, prakrati is like a body of God. Ramanuja's philosophy conceives of Brahman, jiva and prakrati as three eternal elements, but the jiva and prakrati are like Ishwara's body, not separate from Him. Ramanuja finds the basis for his qualified-monism in Brahadaranyaka-Upanishada with reference to Body and Soul (शरीर-शरीरी) relation doctrine found in it, which declares that "Brahman is that which lives within the soul, for whom the soul is like a body, but of which the soul is not aware[68]". Dayananda's view is that in this mantra the soul has been referred to as the body of Brahman in a figurative way only. Of all the objects in the world, the soul is the most subtle, but even subtler than it, is Brahman and Brahman therefore, inheres in the soul, a fact which the soul or the jiva is ignorant of. But He is distinct from the soul, and it is incorrect to assume any type of identity between the soul and Brahman. Though Swami Dayananda has not analysed Ramanuja's philosophy in detail, but it appears inappropriate and untenable to him to accept Ramanuja's concept of internal difference (स्वगत भेद) in Brahman. In his "Satyartha Prakash," he comments, "it is not reasonable on the part of Ramanuja to hold three entities as eternal i. e. Brahman qualified with jiva and Prakrati in his philosophy and yet to accept monism though qualified[69]. Ramanuja established the theory of Vishishtadvaita in opposition to Shankara's conception of Brahmadvaita, and has accepted Brahman, jiva and prakrati as the three eternal elements. Despite this, he could not wean himself away from the theory of non-dualism, and thus treating jiva, prakrati and Brahman as insepa-rable and one he propounded the theory of Vishishtadvaita. But Swami Dayananda courageously ventures even further and accepts Jiva, Brahman and Prakrati as three eternal entities, not as parts of a whole, but as three distinct entities with their own indepen-dent natures. In Dayananda's philosophy, God is omnipotent, the creator, the guiding principle, the dispenser of the fruits of actions, while the jiva is finite in its knowledge, an independent agent of actions, and the sufferer of the fruits of his own actions, whereas prakrati is inert, the object of experience. It is because of this view that Dayananda's philosophy is known in Indian philosophy as the theory of the three eternals.

5
SOUL

Proofs in the existence of Soul

Along with the other Vedic philosophers, Swami Dayananda, too, believes that the soul is an eternal, conscious element. Regarding the existence of a conscious being apart from the body, he has taken a definite view that such entity exists. For him, the Vedas are revealed and authoritative texts and they contain scattered references to the conscious element living within the body, which is described as the jiva or soul.[1] Not merely this, but in the Upanishads and the six systems much has been discussed on the subject of the soul's existence. In the Upanishads, practical as well as rational proofs of the existence of the soul can be found in the teacher-disciple dialogue in the tale of Indra and Virochana[2]. And it appears that Swami Dayananda has accepted them literally. However, inspite of this, wherever he has thought it necessary, he has, in his 'Satyarth Prakasha' refuted the views of those schools which do not accept the soul as an eternal conscious element, and also sought to establish its existence through arguments and proofs.

Criticism of materialism—Whether there is a permanent conscious entity within the body which functions as the agent of knowledge and action, is a subject of which there are and there can be numerous opinions. And among these, the sect of Indian materialists, known as the Charvaka philosophy. hold that the consciousness residing in the body takes its birth from the union and amalgamation of physical substances. Just as drunkenness arises from eating or drinking intoxicants, the jiva arises and then dies with the body[3]. There is no place in this for any permanent soul, which is eternal and indestructible. Swami Dayananda is not satisfied with such a postulate. His main argument against the Charvaka thought is that the union of the four materials earth, water, air and fire do not "produce consciousness in the body as drunkenness arises and neither is it destroyed because drunkenness occurs only in conscious entities, not in material or physical objects[4]." There is no doubt that alcoholic substances lead to

drunkenness in the living body, but it is not possible to infer from this that the jiva or soul will also arise in the body through the union of physical substances. Even alcoholic substances make the living drunk and not the lifeless. Besides, even as an argument, the Charvaka view has no appeal. It is impossible for existence to arise out of nōn-existence. Physical substances are completely lacking in consciousness, and hence it is irrational to presume the birth of the consciousness from the unconscious, because the unconscious completely lacks the conscious element. And, if it is argued that consciousness exists in latent form in the matter, then Charvakas would convert their inert, material substance into conscious one. Consequently, this system of thought would no longer remain materialistic, it would become a votary of spiritualism. Thus, any materialistic system of thought which presumes the origin of the consciousness in the inert or unconscious does not appear acceptable in any form.

Critical Analysis of Biological theories—In the modern age the same philosophical view-point has been reiterated, though in a more subtle and sophisticated form. This is the view of some scientists. In it, the body of living beings is subjected to analytical study, and on this basis, it is declared that all the actions of living beings are controlled by the brain. There is a vast nervous system pervading the entire body. Every action of the body is spurred by these nerves. The physiologist does not believe that bodily actions have their origin in the conscious element, the soul. **In reality, it is beyond the scope of this science to study such a subject as soul.** It's proper scope is the study of the origin and structure of the body, the functions of different organs and actions resulting from the contact between the body and its environment. According to physiology, life is no more than the action and reaction resulting from the interaction between the body and the environment. But what is soul ? This question does not concern this science, and neither is it a problem on which this science can usefully cogitate. In the opinion of a famous scientist, 'To the biologist the actualities are organisms and their doings and life is a generalized concept denoting their peculiar quality. What life in essence or principle is; he does not know[5]." Upto this point, not merely Swami Dayananda, even any other philosopher can

have no difference with such scientific study. The philosopher searches not only for the practical reality of life but also for that power which is the basis of life. But if, like the psychologists, we deny the very existence of the soul or the conscious power and defend our stand with the biologist's help who argues that the brain is the source of consciousness and that the brain itself is the agent of all bodily actions through the nervous system, the result will be a conflict between the philosophy and psychology. Wundt refuted the notion of soul, but despite this, he accepted the fact of consciousness and possessed faith in introspection. During his period, psychology was the science of consciousness. But Watson refused to accept the existence of any conscious element which is abstract and objectively imperceptible. In his opinion, the use of the term 'consciousness' in psychology was merely the revival of the soul accepted by medieval philosophical thinking. According to behaviourism, the entire complex of a living being's action can be understood in terms of stimulus-response, and hence there is no need to postulate the existence of any soul or conscious element.

Whether conscious soul exists in the body or not, can be judged by the criterion bequeathed to us by Swami Shankaracharya. He says that if any living being possesses the three qualities to act, not to act or act in the opposite, (कर्तुं अकर्तुं एवं अन्यथा कर्तुं) it should be presumed that it possesses a soul.[6] The body immediately responds to the stimuli it receives from the environment. According to behaviourism, if my body receives a specific stimulus from the environment, my body must respond to it in a specific manner. But, as against this, we observe that it depends upon our will whether we slap a person, refrain from slapping him or rewarding him in response to the slap that he has planted on our face. The inference to be drawn from this is that man is not bound to a specific response to a specific stimulus, instead, he is free to respond in a variety of ways. In the face of this, behaviourism fails to impress. It tends to reduce human behaviour as mechanical, in which the question of the agent's free will does not arise. In contrast, the criterion given us by Shankaracharya allows full possibility of freedom of will. Besides, it is also true that actions themselves cannot arouse consciousness of the actions. Prof. Malkani is of the view that "The intelligent response cannot be a quality of the matter which constitute the nervous system."[7]

It becomes apparent from the preceding analysis that, without accepting the reality of a conscious element independent of inert matter, it is not possible to explain the human actions on intellectual basis. It is impossible for the consciousness to arise from the unconscious. Material things cannot illuminate actions, they themselves need light to illuminate them, and without this bodily actions are inconceivable. Some biologists, too, have now come to accept about the soul that, "It is neither a product of matter and energy nor an outcome of the increasing complexities of constellations, it is an expression of the reality of which atoms and their movements are also but conceptual aspects."[8] Though this statement reflects non-dualism, but it undoubtedly accepts that there is some conscious element in the body, an element that is not born in or through the body.

Swami Dayananda accepts the soul, as distinct from the body, to be an eternal truth He totally rejects the materialistic view which denies the truth of the soul. Howevei, he would also not agree with the last part of the above quotation, that "it is an expression of the reality of which atoms and their movements are also but conceptual aspects." Unlike the Brahmavadins he also does not treat the soul as the reflection of Brahman in ignorance. What his conception of the soul is will be considered in the following pages.

NATURE OF THE SOUL

अजामेकां लोहित शुक्ल कृष्णां बह्वीः प्रजाः सृजमानां सरूपाः ।
अजोह्येको जुषमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्त भोगामजोऽन्यः ।।

Shveta .U.4.5

"Prakrati, jiva and Paramatma are all three eternal, which means they are never born, which also means that these three are the causes of the world. They themselves. do not have any cause. Because of his indulgence in this eternal prakrati, the eternal jiva becomes enmeshed, while Paramatma neither experiences it nor becomes enmeshed in it."[9]

The soul is eternal—On the basis of this Upanishadic mantra, Dayananda accepts three eternal entities, and soul is one of them. The soul, by its very nature, is eternal. It has originated neither from the elements of nature, as the naturalists claim, nor from Brahman, as the Advaita philosophers hold.[10] Just as the Brahman

Himself has no cause, the soul, too, has no cause. It is the law of logical argument that the substance which is immortal is eternal. Anything which has never been born will also never suffer destruction. Swami Dayananda holds that the jiva is both immortal and eternal. When the body suffers destruction, the jiva does not die. It is only transferred to another body. St. Thomas Acquinas, the Christian theologian, has accepted the soul as immortal but he has not considered it eternal. As per Christian faith, he holds that God creates a new soul whenever a new living being comes to life.[11] Descartes, too, appears to be influenced by this view. Though Descartes has accepted God, mind and matter as separate substances, but he also opines that the jiva and matter are God's creations and if God so wishes, He can destroy them also.[12] This implies that God is the sole truely eternal substance, while the mind and matter are the substances of his creation. Descartes accepted St. Acquinas' contention that the soul is immortal, but he made it dependent on God for its existence. Spinoza reiterated the same conception, though in different form. He says that the Thought (jiva) and Extension (matter) are only two of the infinite attributes of God through which He becomes renowned in the world. Spinoza is of the opinion that the very question of the soul's immortality and eternal nature is ridiculous because Thought (soul) is nothing but an attribute of the Universal (God). Moral life cannot have a sound basis without accepting the immortality of the soul. Kant also has stressed the immortality of the soul as an essential basis for ethical life. He accepts the soul as the transcendental unity of apperception. When Kant accepts the fact of previous births on the basis of pleasure and pain in this life, it appears that he accepts the soul as eternal, because rebirth automatically suggests not one but numerous earlier births, and one can then rationally arrive at the conception of an eternal soul. But Kant's views on this question are not clear or explicit. The statement that God created Adam and then breathed life into his nostrils appears to be the foundation of all the above-mentioned philosophers except Kant. The Koran differs from the Bible in some measure. The Koran holds that God breathed life into the nostrils of Adam, and that this life breath was the life of all future beings to come. According to Islam, the soul was created only once, and just as thousands of lamps can be lighted from one lamp,

in the same manner, a part of the consciousness of the parents is transmitted to the child. Islam further assumes that once the jiva has been created, it does not suffer destruction but instead, that it exists during this life, and after life ends, it resides in the grave till the Day of Judgement. After that, it proceeds either to heaven or hell for eternity to suffer the consequences of its actions. But we can certainly ask, just as the flame ends when the lamp is extinguished, is it not possible that consciousness may end with the end of life ?

It is against logical and rational argumentation to assume the soul to be immortal but also something that is created, because whatever is created must also suffer annihilation. Besides, there is the related question: out of what material did God create the soul ? If it is suggested that physical matter was the material, it is unconvincing because jiva cannot be created out of matter that is inert and lacking in consciousness. If it is suggested that God created the soul out of Himself, it must be asked whether God is made of parts ? Again, if it is presumed that God divided Himself into the souls, then it would imply that God can suffer mutations and it will vitiate the character of God. Apart from all these arguments, there remains the most complex question whether God had any need to assume the form of the soul and become bonded in ignorance and if so, what that need was ? The basic contention that the soul is a created one, an entity that is brought into existence, does not appear to be a sound principle at all.

Unlike Christian and Islam religions and many other thinkers, Swami Dayananda does not believe that the jiva or soul is a created substance, and neither does he accept Shankara's non-dualistic view that it is a product of ignorance. His main objection to the advaita view is that Brahman is pure consciousness and knowledge. Then, how can ignorance bring this omnipotent and omniscient being under its influence and distort its true nature ? Why does the pure, blissful and conscious Brahman chose to be shrouded by ignorance and become involved in the cycle of birth and death, which is also filled with pain and pleasure ? Swami Dayananda asks the mayavadins whether the purity of Brahman can remain intact despite its contact with ignorance ? In Advaita philosophy, it is held that the jiva originates in ignorance, and that ignorance is an illusion. Gaudpadacharya, in his Mandukya-karika, a commentary on the Mandukyopani-

shada states that, "there is neither negation nor creation nor no one is bound and no one is a worshipper, there is none who desires salvation, and neither is there any free, emancipated soul, this is the transcendental (paramarthika) truth."[13] Shankara in his own commentary expresses agreement with the Karika and accepts that the origin of the soul is merely an illusion. In complete contradiction to this Swami Dayananda accepts the existence of the soul as a truth, and he cannot derive any satisfaction from the principle of maya or illusion. This principle is incapable of sustaining relation between the worshipper and the worshipped, the experienced and the experiencing agent and knower and the known. When all these become one, then who is to worship whom, who is to experience what, and who is to know whom ? Since everything is thus rendered illusory, normal practical life becomes meaningless and purposeless. It can be said without the least doubt that this philosophy completely fails to reconcile knowledge with practice, and thus philosophy becomes redundant for the common mind. As against this, Swami Dayananda establishes the soul on a separate and eternal foundation. In his view, the soul does not merge or identify with Brahman in its state of salvation, but it does become a participant in the bliss of Brahman.

Characteristics of the Soul—On the basis of the aphorisms of Nyaya philosophy, Swami Dayananda points out that desire, aversion, activity, pleasure pain, and knowledge are the characteristics of the soul. The body is inert, therefore, there is no motion in it. Inert matter lacks desire, knowledge and other such attributes, and hence the master of the body is the soul. and he resides in it.[14]

Nyaya philosophy treats desire, aversion etc., as the signs of (*Linga*) soul.[15] The body possesses a conscious soul because human beings are seen to exhibit desire, aversion, effort, pleasure, pain, and knowledge, while not even one of these attributes is discoverable in prakrati. Consequently, these are the signs (*linga*) of the soul, as distinct from prakrati. The presence of these signs in a body tells us that there is conscious soul in it which differs from the body itself. Here Nyaya thinkers make it clear that these are not the natural attributes of the corporeal body. In this case then these signs are proved to be the attributes of the soul. This, therefore, means that the soul possesses the attributes of

desire, aversion, effort, etc. Like the Nyaya philosophers, Swami Dayananda has also accepted these attributes of the soul both as attributes and as evidence to prove the existence of the soul. However, Swami Darshanananda, the disciple of Swami Dayananda, has split them up into two groups (1) desire, knowledge, effort, etc., (2) pleasure, pain and aversion. His contention is that the latter cannot be the natural attributes of the soul, instead they are adventitious, which come into existence when the soul comes into contact with the body, whereas desire, effort and knowledge are the natural attributes of the soul. Swami Dayananda did not divide these attributes into two groups, because he did not pay attention to this aspect. However, Swami Dayananda does not hold an opinion contradicting any such division, because wherever he has characterized the attributes of the liberated soul, he has not mentioned any adventitious attribute. Swami Dayananda opines that the soul is of the nature of knowledge, but this does not imply that the soul is as intelligent as Paramatma. He means that soul's nature of knowledge is the power to know and without the power of knowing it is impossible to obtain knowledge of things.[16] Knowledge of the second kind i.e. acquired knowledge has been referred to as adventitious knowledge. The soul's natural ability to obtain knowledge is its innate characteristic, but the knowledge that it acquires through this pewer is called adventitious knowledge.

The soul is limited in knowledge—The soul, by nature, is limited in knowledge.[17] Swami Dayananda here offers a very simple solution to the problem of ignorance. The question: what is ignorance ?, is a very complex philosophical question, which even the sophisticated thinking of Shankara could not answer. Accepting ignorance as a universal power is not beyond doubt, because power can subsist only in some powerful entity, and only God can conceivably have the capacity to possess a power that operates universally. The central error of Advaita philosophy lies in accepting maya, which is indistinguishable from ignorance, as a universal creative power. This was done to support the non-dualistic theory. On the other hand, if one refutes the principle of maya, one is faced with the question: why does the eternal soul become involved in the cycle of birth and death, pain and pleasure? Swami Dayananda's answer to this is that the jiva is by its nature

limited in knowledge, He further argues that the soul is unlike the infinitely knowledgeab e God. The very factor of being limited in knowledge, conceals within it the fact of ignorance, and it is this ignorance which prevents jivatma or soul from realizing its own true nature and that o the Supreme Being.[18] And because of this jiva perceives purity in impurity, pleasure in pain, consciousness in unconsciousness and permanence in transient and thus becomes involved in the cycle of birth and death.[19]

Relationship between Soul and Mind—After coming in the body the soul conducts all its activities through the mind. In Swami Dayananda's view, the mind is an evolute of prakrati. In this view, he is in full agreement with the Sankhya concept. He explains further that the first evolute of prakrati was universal intellect (mahatatva), then ego and five subtle elements from them ten powers of senses and the eleventh mind came into existence.[20] Since the mind arises from the pure satva prakrati, it has the power to obtain and retain knowledge. When it comes into contact with the soul, it appears to have become conscious. Consequently, many scholars fail to distinguish between the mind and the soul. Western philosophers in particular do not distinguish between these two entities. Vedic philosophers conceive of the mind as the means of obtaining and possessing knowledge. The soul uses the mind as an instrument through the medium of which it performs various bodily functions. The soul obtains knowledge of the external world through the sense organs and the mind. This knowledge occurs when the sense organs come into contact with an object The sense organs communicate this knowledge to the mind which, in its turn, being in contact with the soul, transmits it to the soul.[21] The jiva becomes conscious of pain and pleasure only through the mind. The mind accompanies the jiva when the jiva leaves one body and possesses another at the time of rebirth, which implies that the mind accompanies the soul till the soul achieves salvation.

Residing in the body, the soul activates the body successively through the mind, intellect, consciousness (चित्त) and ego, which is also called four fold internal-organ (अन्तःकरण चतुष्टय). In Swami Dayananda's philosophy, the mind, intellect and the sense organs are means to achieve worldy pleasure and finally salvation. The Upanishada also declares that, "the soul is like the charioteer

in this body which is akin to a chariot, the intellect is the pilot, the mind is the reign, while the sense organs are its horses. The objects of the world constitute the chariot's path. Seers accept the soul endowed with mind and senses as the enjoyer of the world."[22] At the same time, the Upanishads also say that the individual who possesses an enlightened intellect as pilot and an enlightened mind as reigns, is able to obtain the highest place of Brahman.[23]

The atomic size of the soul - Dayananda believes that the size of the soul is that of an atom.[24] In the field of philosophic literature, there are three streams of thought regarding the dimensions of the soul—infinite, medium and atomic. When the soul is referred to as infinite, it is meant that it pervades everything just as the sky pervades everything. Such a view suffers from many drawbacks. For instance, to accept that the soul is all-pervasive would lead one to assume that a single soul is inherent in every body, in which case, it should be aware of the pleasures and sufferings of other souls also. But, in fact, this does not happen. Hence, the soul cannot be all-pervasive. The view that the soul has a medium dimension means that it pervades the entire body. This is the Jain view. It means that the soul assumes the same form as that of the body which it inhabits, implying that the soul living in an ant's body has the size of an ant, while it will come into the human body, it will assume the form of human body. Presumably, then in infancy the soul's size would be small because the child's body is small, and when the individual grows to a larger size, the soul also expands correspondingly.[25] Such a view would mean that the soul is composed of parts (*avayavi*) because any entity without parts does not increase or decrease with the size of the body. If it is accepted that the jiva is made of parts (*saavyava*), it would mean that it is subjected to union or disjunction of parts. In that case the soul would be subject to decay and distortion, because an increase or decrease in its size would be impossible without an addition or detraction of parts. Hence, the soul of Jain conception would be capable of decay and not immortal. The third view on this issue is that the soul has the dimension of an atom, and is equally subtle. Hence, being subtle, it can easily enter into and possess

the grossest and most subtle of bodies without distortion or decay. This is Dayananda's view. He further explains that the atomic jiva inhabits the body and controls it's various functions through the mind.[26] Swami Shankaracharya also accepted this atomic conception of the soul. But according to him it is infinite and all pervasive Brahman who becomes jiva by the adjunct of ignorance.[27] Ramanuja, too conceives of the soul as being like an atom in size, but he assumes that it is the body of God. It means that soul has no existence distinct from God. But Dayananda does not make the soul dependent upon God for its existence. In his opinion the soul is atomic in size and exists independently of God. In our opinion, Dayananda's views on this subject have a solid foundation in the Upanishads.

Souls are many in number—The fact that there is a multiplicity of bodies in the world, and also that these bodies differ from each other in their actions and experiences, gives strength to the view that separate souls inhabit separate bodies. Swami Dayananda declares that souls are numerous. Nyaya, Vaisheshika and Sankhya philosophies also subscribe to the same view.[28] On the other hand there are some scholars like Madhva who accept that the souls are infinite in number. Swami Dayananda does not hold this view. He argues that if it is presumed that souls are infinite in number, then the arrangement of fruits of actions and next birth will become impossible, because it is impossible to imagine any power which can dispense the infinite fruits of the infinite actions done by an infinity of souls. It is because of this that the Sankhya and Vaisheshika philosophies opine that souls are many in number, a fact which is supported by the arrangement for birth and death.

All souls are similar—St. Thomas Acquinas believes that the souls of animals are not immortal, only the human soul are immortal.[29] Descartes also accepted the same view. But the element, which separates living beings from non livings, is consciousness and since this consciousness is found equally in human beings and animals, it is appropriate to assume that the souls of men and animals are similar. The same soul can reside in a man and an animal depending upon its actions. Among animals it is primarily restricted to experience (भोग) while at the human stage it is capable of both experience and action (भोग व कर्म).

Madhva and Vallabha have divided souls into three categories. Madhva is of the view that souls are of the following three kinds—(a) souls capable of attaining salvation (मुक्तयोग्य:) (b) souls which always live in the world (नित्य संसारी), (c) souls which live always under the influence of ignorance (तमोयोग्य:). Of these, the first is capable of attaining salvation, a classification which includes the following five kinds—divine, seers, fathers (pitra), chakravarti and superior. The second kind are eternally worldly, and hence they can never attain salvation. They remain enmeshed in the cycle of life and death and rise to the level of heaven and hell to enjoy their actions. The third kind of souls are the souls of monsters, and hence it has the following four kinds—monsters, giants, witches and irreligious beings. Among the three categories mentioned above only the souls of the first category have a right to salvation.[30] It appears that this classifcation of souls is based on the three constituents of prakrati i.e. satva, rajas and tamas. The satvic beings are free, the rajasic are trapped in the cycles of life and death and heaven and hell, while the tamasic beings always live in bondage. But Swami Dayananda does not accept any such classification because he believes that all souls, irrespective of their being living in human or animal bodies, are similar. He says that all souls are equal, but they attain either purity or impurity due to their indulgence in virtuous or non-virtuous deeds.[31] The question whether the soul of a man can inhabit the body of a woman or an animal and whether the souls of the latter can inhabit the body of a man, Swami Dayananda explains that "yes, it does change bodies in this manner."[32] In this way, Swami Dayananda also effectively demolishes the Jain prejudice that women do not have a right to salvation. His basic contention is that a jiva attains the body which is appropriate to its deeds.

The soul is the agent and the experiencer—Like other Vedic philosophers, Swami Dayananda fully accepts the concept of karma or action and the fruits of actions. However, one characteristic feature of his philosophy is that he does not accept the soul as being by nature either free or in bondage. His reasoning is that if the soul is, by its very essence, in bondage, salvation becomes impossible. If, on the contrary, it is by nature free, it can never come into a state of bondage.[33] Sankhya

philosophy considers 'purusha' or soul to be inactive (a non-agent) and unattached (asanga). Nyaya conceives of it as doer and experiencing agent both, while Vedanta also treats the soul as an independent agent. Sankhya philosophy accepts the principle of karma and the fruits of karma, but it does not accept the purusha as a free agent of actions.[34] Many scholars hold that in Sankhya philosophy, 'purusha' is not by nature an agent, but when it comes into contact with the ego or the conscience, it feels itself as the doer. Swami Dayananda does not agree with this interpretation. Instead, he goes along with the Nyaya and Vedanta view of the soul as an independent agent or actor, because in the absence of this concept the entire theory of karma and its fruit cannot be sustained.[35]

The soul is an independent agent of his actions, and once it arrives in the world, it is no longer a puppet in God's hands. If independence of action is not attributed to the soul, it will not be the experiencer of fruits. If the soul performs every action according to the will of God alone, the soul becomes inactive or a non-agent, and thus there is no need for the system of virtue and vice existing in the world. In Swami Dayananda's philosophy, the soul is free to indulge in actions, but it is dependent upon God for the fruits of those actions. Our independent actions are limited by the extent to which we are allowed freedom of action, and it is for these deeds that we shall either be rewarded or punished.

The soul takes rebirth—The jiva or soul is immortal, something that was never born and something that will never die. Like other Indian thinkers, Swami Dayananda believes that the soul after the death of the present body, assumes another body, which is determined by its deeds. Those indulging in low and vile deeds fall to the level of vegetable life, those who are mean in their actions obtain the bodies of animals on rebirth, while gentle persons indulging in virtuous actions obtain human form. Within these three broad classes, there are many finer sub-divisions and the jiva obtains a body specifically according to his deeds.[36] The question that has now to be faced is: why does the soul has no recollection of the deeds of previous births ? Swami Dayananda's explanation is that the soul has limited knowledge and hence he forgets its previous births. Besides, the nature of mind is such that it does the knowledge of one

sudject at one moment. Being completely involved with the actions and things in the present life, the jiva fails to recollect its past life. Through the practice of yoga, the mind is purified and earlier lives are recollected. In keeping with the Christian tradition, St. Thomas Acquinas declares that God creates a new soul every time a creature is born. This principle is similar to the Islamic concept of the fresh creation of souls. But this violates God's system of justice, because it implies that God grants happy and miserable lives to new souls, by determining the environment in which the soul takes birth, without reference to deeds of past lives. Here one can ask as to why God should send one soul to a rich and good family and another to a poor or vicious environment, when the soul has not yet indulged in any deeds, sinful or virtuous ? This question baffles those who accept the principle that God creates a new soul at every birth. Dayananda's firm belief is that soul is never created afresh and that even God cannot reward or punish any soul in the absence of corresponding deeds, otherwise, He would appear to be unjust.[37]

The Four States of Consciousness—There are four states of consciousness—*waking* (जाग्रत), *dreaming* (स्वप्न), *deep sleep* (सुषुप्ति) and *pure conciousness* (तुरीय). During its existence in the body the soul experiences first three states. In the waking state, the soul does its actions through the senses and acquires knowledge of the world. While in dreaming it observes his own mental impressions. In this state sensuous activities remain suspended. In the state of deep sleep the soul is immersed in dreamless sleep, in which the activities of the senses as well as the functions of mental states are stopped. In this state the soul remains completely ignorant because of excessiveness of tamas, but jiva does not cease to exist. Dayananda opines that in deep sleep the soul establishes in *causal body* (कारण-शरीर) which is of the form of *nature*(प्रकृति) and common to all living beings. Dayananda fruther says that there is a fourth state also and that is *turiya* or state of pure consciousness.[38] Soul attains this state in trance or samadhi. In this state the soul remains in pure consciousness, completely engrossed with God.

Soul is neither free nor bound by nature—By its nature, the soul is neither bound nor free. This is an unusual viewpoint, heard for the first time in the field of philosophical literature.

Some scholars cite the principle of Sankhya philosophy, and argue that the jiva is inactive and unattached (asanga). Swami Dayananda does not find this principle logical and good because in the absence of action, the possibility of experiencing is also negated. Besides, he also does not concede that the jiva is unattached (asanga) with the nature, since this will imply that the jiva is by nature independent and free, and any soul which is free cannot enter a state of bondage. On the other hand, if it is presumed that the jiva is by nature bound, then salvation would become inconceivable because soul by nature is bound.[39] Consequently, the only theory that appears suitable is Swami Dayananda's view that the jiva comes under bondage due to its contact with prakrati. And, the main reason for the soul falling into bondage is that its capacity and knowledge both are limited. Because of this. the objects of the world conceal their real nature from the soul.

On the other hand, when the soul inclines towards true knowledge, removes one by one the various affects of ignorance, and thus enlightens itself with the pure light of true knowledge, then ignorance is destroyed and the true nature of each object stands revealed to the soul. In this state, the soul moves towards God and makes constant progress along the path to salvation. Worship of God and penance take it towards truth. Thus soul becomes free and attain salvation. Therefore, the conclusion is that soul comes under bondage by ignorance and gets freedom by pure knowledge. It is neither free nor bound by nature.

Vices are never pardoned by God – Swami Dayananda ordains that salvation can be attained through avoidance of ignorance, evil impression and non-virtuous deeds, and by practising purification of the conscience, veracity, acquiring knowledge. just behaviour, worship of God, etc[40] Swamiji rejects the view either that God will forgive us our evil deeds if we beg pardon with sufficient contrition, or that salvation can be ours by accepting some particular faith, the views put forth by Christianity and Islam. Instead, he believes with utmost firmness that the jiva can become free of its evil deeds only by following the path of truth. He considers irrational the principle that sins are forgiven. He declares that salvation can be obtained by elevating knowledge

through practising righteousness and by adopting the right means. He says that whatever a man does he should act with complete impartiality and justice.[41]

Salvation by Worship—In his introduction on commentary on the Vedas, Swamiji lays great emphasis upon worship as a means to salvation. Worship of God purifies the conscience and thus it becomes capable of true knowledge.[42] **The purpose of worship is not to please God so that He may forgive us our sins, but instead that "glorification of God leads to love of God and improvement of the soul's attributes, deeds and nature. And prayer leads to freedom from pride and ego, provides courage and obtains divine help and finally worship leads to the realization of the Supreme Being."**[43] According to Dayananda, God inspires those who are the seekers of salvation, but without penance, deep meditation and virtuous deeds, the soul cannot attain salvation.

MOKSHA OR SALVATION

"The individual who knows the nature of knowledge and ignorance both, he, by overcoming death through his virtuous deeds, attains liberation by true knowledge.

(Satyarth Prakash, p. 236)

In Indian philosophy, almost every philosopher has sought for a solution to the main problem of life, i e. **Sufferings**. To say nothing of others, even the materialistic Charvaka philosophers preach escape from pain. The atheistic Jain and Buddhist, the six Vedic systems and the Upanishads, all preach that man should strive to escape from sufferings. Swami Dayananda is no exception to this rule. His view manifests the same spirit that pervades the Indian philosophic tradition. The main riddle of life—escape from pain and suffering - is also the major riddle in his philosophy. The following excerpt from his book in the form of a dialogue exemplifies this :[44]

Question—What does salvation mean ?

Answer—(Dayananda) 'मुञ्चन्ति पृथग्भवन्ति जना यस्यां सा मुक्ति'

The aphorism says that which involves liberation is salvation.

Question—Liberation from what ?

Answer—Liberation from that which all souls strive to escape from.

Question – From what do they desire to escape ?

Answer—That from which they wish to escape ?

Question – From what do they wish to be liberated ?

Answer – From *Sufferings.*

Every living being in the world wishes to put an end to his miseries. No one wishes to bring sufferings upon himself, and hence every living being directs his actions towards the removal of sufferings. Sankhya philosophy declares that the prime object of man is the complete annihilation of sufferings.[45] Experience shows that in this world, a mild effort removes some suffering for some time, intense efforts remove more sufferings for a more longer period. Hence, if extreme efforts are made, it is possible to annihilate sufferings for ever. This permanent or eternal destruction of sufferings is salvation. Yoga philosophy also accepts that man's prime duty is to end sufferings. Maharishi Patanjali in his yoga-Sutra points out the four noble truths which are—*heya* (suffering), *heyahetu* (ignorance, which is the cause of suffering), hana (the annihilation of suffering, which means salvation), and *hanopaaya* (the eight-fold path to the destruction of suffering). In his philosophy, the end or final removal of suffering has been referred to as *Kaivalya.*[46]

In Swami Dayananda's opinion, the cause of suffering is the ignorance of the soul. The soul becomes bound to the cycle of birth and death because it is enmeshed in ignorance, and thus it comes to experience sufferings. What is the nature of ignorance ? Swami Dayananda refers to the aphorism of Yoga philosophy and explains the nature of ignorance as perception of eternal in the transient, the purity in impurity, pleasure in pain and consciousness in unconcious things.[47] In other words, ignorance implies to posit in one self the wrong knowledge of the nature of world objects. The sole means of escaping from ignorance, in Swami Dayananda's view, is the obtaining of knowledge. The aphorism 'वेत्ति यथावत्तत्व पदार्थ स्वरूपं यया सा विद्या' means that which, enlightens the real character of the substances,[48] is called knowledge. Learned person always sees transitoriness in transcient, impurity in impure, pains in sufferings and unconsciousness in unconscious things and he also percieves permanence in eternals, purity in pure things, happiness in pleasant things and consciousness in sentient beings. Real knowledge helps to destroy attachment

towards the world, and in consequence, the soul's deeds lose their hold upon it. As soon as deeds decay or come to an end, the very basis, on which the soul must have a rebirth is destroyed.

Means to salvation—In order to win freedom from the bonds of the world and to achieve salvation, Dayananda directs the path of glorification, prayer and worship of God, four-fold means (*sadhana chatushteya*), and practice of Yoga. Glorification of God refines and improves the nature, attributes and deeds of the soul in consonance with the corresponding attributes in God. Prayer also leads to destruction of vanity, increases enthusiasm, and helps in obtaining God's grace, while by worship one gets realization of God and identification with Him. Four-fold means (साधन चतुष्टय) are, to make distinction in truth and falsehood, dispassion, six kinds of virtues (Shat-sampat) i.e. tranquality (sama), restraint (Dama), renunciation (uparati), resignation (titiksha), concentration (samadhi) and stead-fastness of the mind (Samadhan), intense desire for liberation (Mumukshatva). The last is practice of Yoga. By practising the yoga the sadhaka realizes the inner forces like mind etc. Yoga facilitates the realization of God.[49]

Apart from the above means, Swami Dayananda has laid emphasis upon *right conduct*. By *right conduct* he means the pursuance of truth in mind, words and deeds. He opines that the basic cause of suffering is sinful action, falsehood, etc., while the solid foundation of happiness is truthfulness with other virtuous activities. In his philosophy, Swami Dayananda does not accept any means to salvation which focusses exclusively upon external purity of the body and the performance of rituals, to the complete exclusion of purity of consciousness (चित्त शुद्धि), and the purity of attributes, deeds and nature.

State of the soul in salvation—What is the nature of the soul when it achieves salvation? In other words, in this state, does the soul retain its independent existence, or does it become completely immersed in Brahman? In salvation does it possess a body or not? In what way does it experience the bliss of salvation? Such questions have their own significance. The following paragraphs outlines Swami Dayananda's answers.

Swami Dayananda explains that "when all the complexes of ignorance binding the heart of living beings are removed, when all his doubts are dispelled, and when all his evil deeds are destroyed, then Paramatma or God, who pervades the soul within and without, rests in him."[50] This statement makes it clear that in salvation, the soul's ignorance is completely annihilated, and that the soul wins freedom from the bonds of its actions, that is, its samskaras or impressions In this state, the soul attains to its purest state, and it is established in Brahman Just as all other things are established in the sky, the soul is established in the most subtle and all-pervasive Brahman.

Some scholars, especially the Neo-Vedantists belonging to the tradition of Shankaracharya, believe that the soul merges with Brahman in salvation. In their view, Brahman and soul are not distinct and hence when the soul's ignorance is destroyed, the soul is liberated and it identifies with and merges into Brahman. Dayananda refutes this contention as a completely irrational one. His main objection is that if the soul merges with Brahman, then who will enjoy the bliss of salvation Consequently, all the preaching about salvation and the efforts to attain it, all becomes entirely fruitless. In his opinion, this state of the soul is not the state of salvation, but the state of the soul's destruction.[51] Dayananda's refutation of the Vedantist view is a very powerful one. Referring to an Upanishadic mantra, Dayananda establishes the distinct existence of the soul in salvation by saying that "the soul, who knows the supreme truth, pure knowledge and infinite, existing within its own intellect and soul, becomes established in the all-pervasive Brahman and thus attains all of his desires in Him.[52]

In the same way, Swami Dayananda also criticizes the Buddhist conception of Nirvana. According to Buddhist philosophy, the soul is an aggregate or synthetic unity (संघात) of the five elements (स्कन्ध) of form (rupa), reason (vigyan), mental disposition (samskara), feeling (Vedna) and perception (sangya). When nirvana is obtained, this aggregate comes to an end, and that is why Buddhist philosophy conceives of nirvana as being a state of extinction. Here Swami Dayananda's objection is : if the soul becomes extinct in the state of *nirvana*, then what is the advantage of obtaining *nirvana* ? Besides, who gets freedom from suffering ? And who will enjoy the bliss of nirvana ?

The Buddhist conception of nirvana contemplates the extinction of the soul along with the destruction of sufferings. Consequently, it would be more appropriate, in such a case, to argue that nirvana means the extinction of the soul rather than the destruction of sufferings. Since this conception implies the absence of sufferings, it is essentially negative conception of salvation.

Along with Madhva, some philosophers, declare that in salvation, the soul resides in heaven. According to their conception, heaven is a separate abode where the soul lives. This conception is similar to the one found in the Puranas. Swami Dayananda does not accept the conception of salvation as a residence in heaven in which all worldly pleasure are available. Philosophers of this school point out that there are four kinds of salvation—*saalokya*, which means the existence of God and the soul at one place, *saamipya*, or the living of the soul near God like a servant, *saanujya*, or living near God as a younger brother and *Saarupya*, or becoming united with God.[53] These philosophers had to accept these four distinct kinds of salvation in heaven because they started with the wrong assumption that the souls differ in their nature and attributes. Otherwise, there was no need to conceive of any distinction in moksha. In opposition to this view, Swami Dayananda does not believe that souls differ from each other in their nature and attributes. He believes that all souls are similar and that each soul has an equal right to salvation. Criticising Madhava's conception of four kinds of moksha, he argues, "in accordance with your conception of four kinds of moksha, the salvation of mosquitoes, insects and living beings of this order is self-established, because all the regions (लोक) that exist belong to God and all living beings exist in these regions, which means that the *Saalokya* form of salvation (moksha) is automatically granted to them. Since God is all pervading and all living being are always near to Him, therefore, *Saamipya* moksha is also available automatically to all beings. Again since the soul is in every way smaller than God but also conscious, he automatically possesses *Saanujya* salvation without any effort. And since all living beings are inherent in Brahman. Thus the *saaujya* form of salvation is also self-established."[54] And as regard *Saarupya* moksha, Dayananda

will not accept it also. This is akin to Neo-Vedantist's concept of identification of soul with Brahman which Dayananda has refuted at a number of places. Swami Dayananda's philosophy is not at all influenced by Puranic conceptions. He has placed philosophy at a purely practical and intellectual plane. If he has accepted anything as having evidential value, he has granted this status only to the Vedas, Upanishads and the Six Systems of philosophy. The philosophy of Madhva, Vallabha and Nimbarka is dominated by emotional worship and it is inclined towards divinity. Swami Dayananda's view is that the liberated purusha or soul lives in the Paramatma and nowhere else. He achieves salvation only when the bonds and knots of ignorance are destroyed.

Does the body exist with soul in salvation—Some scholars believe that in salvation, the soul possesses a subtle body. They argue that in the absence of even a subtle body, it will be impossible for the soul to experience the bliss of salvation. Maharishi does not accept the presence of any material relationship in a state of liberation. In his philosophy, he points out that there are four kinds of bodies. The first is the *'sthoola' or gross body* which is visible, the second is the *'sukshama' or subtle body* which is composed of the *five 'prana'* the *five sense organs*, the *five 'sukshamabhuta, the mind and the intellect*, thus it is a composite of seventeen elements. This has two classifications, the first is physical, which is made up of the sukhama bhuta, and the second is *non-physical which is formed of the soul's natural attributes.* This *non-physical body continues to exist even in salvation*, and it is through this that the soul experiences the bliss of salvation. The third is *causal body* (कारण शरीर) that which is the cause of deep sleep. The forth is referred to as the *turiya body* in which the jiva enters the state of meditation and becomes completely engrossed in the blissful nature of God."[55] Here Dayananda contends that both the gross body and the subtle physical body cease to exist in salvation. Swami Dayananda refers, in this context, to the view of Badari, Vyasa and Gemini Muni, the three main proponents of Vedanta philosophy, and points out that Badari, the father of Vyasa believed that only mind exists with the soul in salvation, but that sense organs and their subtle forces etc., lose their existence.[56] Gemini Muni believed that not only does the mind co-exist with the soul in

salvation, even the subtle forces of the sense organs, prana and the subtle body accompany the soul.[57] Maharishi Badarayana, on the contrary, adopts the mean between existence and non-existense, contending that in salvation, the jiva exists in it's purest form of determination, will, etc., but that suffering, ignorance and impurity do not exist in him.[58] Swami Dayananda's own view is that in salvation, "the soul's natural attributes, such as truth, determination, etc., continue to exist but all sorts of physical relations cease to exist.[59] His view is that in the state of salvation, both gross and subtle body which are physical and the seats of senses do not exist with the soul, only its own attributes exist in pure form. How the soul receives knowledge of the world without mind and other senses when it is in salvation, is explained by the Shatpath Brahman. It says that, "by virtue of its innate powers an emancipated soul acquires, the power of hearing when it wants to hear, the power of touch when wants to touch, the power of vision when wants to see, the power of taste when wants to taste, the power to smell when wants to smell, the power of mind when wants to think, the power of intelligence when wants to ascertain, the power of chit when wants to remember and the power of ego to feel individuality."[60] Through its independent power of will and determination the soul wanders about in the Brahman and experiences His bliss. Dayananda is of the view that the material accompaniment of the soul, the subtle body, which is a constitute of seventeen elements, remains with the soul till the moment of salvation, but it does not enter that state.[61]

Maharishi Dayananda's views on salvation have their foundation in the Vedas and Upanishads. Although Shankaracharya has used the same Upanishads as the foundation of his belief that the soul merges with Brahman in a state of salvation, we find that the Upanishads frequently refer to the independent existence of the soul in salvation. For instance, the Mundakopanishad declares, "the jiva attains perfect equality with Brahman after getting rid of its virtues and sins."[62] This implies that the soul does not become one with Brahman, only that the soul which has known the Supreme Being becomes majestic and blissful like Brahman Himself.[63]

The concept of salvation has meaning and significance only

if the soul is assumed to be eternal and distict from Brahman. It is irrational to visualize the soul as merging with Brahman in salvation. If such an assumption is made, it becomes necessary to answer the question : who will experience salvation ? Since God is perfect in Himself, He is neither an agent nor the one that experiences. And prakrati, being matter, is incapable of being an agent or the one that experiences. In consequence, of the three eternals, the soul is the only one that can perform both these functions. The Upanishads posit blissfulness in salvation only because they assume the existence of an agent to experience it. Otherwise, its revelations become meaningless.

RETURN FROM SALVATION

Salvation means freedom from the pleasures and pains and the cycle of birth and death, "after liberation from which, (the soul) never returns to this world."[64] Swami Dayananda's views on this subject are completely different. He contends that after enjoying the bliss of Brahman for a certain period in salvation, the jiva once again returns to the cycle of birth and death.

He expounds this unique view in his commentary on one of the mantras of the Vedas. He says, "we must recognize as pure and divine the name of that self-enlightened, infinite, ever-liberated Paramatma who allows us to experience the bliss of salvation, and then once again sends us on earth in relation of father and mother."[65] This statement explicitly clarifies that God sends the soul in the world after his experiencing the bliss of salvation. Nyaya and Sankhya conceive of moksha or salvation as the complete cessation (*atyant nivrati*) of sufferings, declaring that "the state of liberation is that in which all sufferings come to a final rest."[66] But, what does the word 'complete' (*atyant*) imply ? This is a controversial question. Some scholars opine that perfect absence means complete cessation, but Swami Dayananda interprets the word 'complete' (*atyant*) to mean extreme. He argues that it is not necessary that the word 'complete' (*atyant*) may refer to completeness alone, it may also refer to extreme also.[67] If this interpretation, which appears more logical, is accepted, salvation cannot be accepted as a state which exists through infinity. Swami Dayananda's belief in the returning of the soul from salvation is based on two points. First, the

soul's capabilities are limited not infinite, and hence all his means to salvation and his efforts in this direction are also limited. Consequently, the outcome of these efforts should also be subject to limitations. How can an infinite result follow upon limited efforts and capability ? If this is wilfully accepted, it destroys the principle of actions and their fruits. Consequently, the limited efforts of the soul cannot obtain infinite salvation for it.

Secondly, the number of jivas, too, is not infinite. Dayananda rejects the notion that souls are infinite in number. He opines that they may be too numerous for us to count, but the very fact that the law of karma operates in the creation, therefore, the number of souls cannot be infinite. The Shruti declares that in Varuna's (God's) domain, even the number of hairs in the eye-lashes of living beings is counted. Besides, this world exists in only one region of the Parmatma, but He Himself is much more than this.[68] If souls had been infinite in number, they would have been spread out in infinite regions of the infinite Brahman. If, on the contrary, it is accepted on the basis of the Shruti that souls are not infinite in number, then there will be a question, that the world may one day be devoid of souls because souls have been achieving salvation since infinity and they will continue to do so into the infinite future. Consequently, one can conceive of a time in the future when the world will be devoid of life. It can be argued in answer that this will not occur in the future, since it has not occured in the past. However, critics may argue that God will not allow creation to be devoid of life, and, therefore, He will create new souls. Swamiji answers this contention thus : "If this happens, then the soul would become mortal and finite, because that which is born must die."[69] Any such contention obstructs the view of the soul as eternal. We find that Vedic philosophy also supports Dayananda's view. Both the Sankhya and Vaisheshika believe that the souls in existence are numerous and not infinite, in view of the fact the Law of Action governs the universe.[70]

Even in the Upanishads, one does come across a few scattered mantras supporting Swami Dayananda's contention. The Mundak, for instance, states, "liberated souls enjoy the bliss of liberation in the region of Brahman, and after the period of salvation (*mahakalpa*), they return to the world again."[71] Swamiji

opines that this period is equal to the time involved in the creation and destruction of the universe 36000 (Thirty six thousand) times. The time period involved in one creation is four thousand thirty two million of years (4 arab, 32 crore), while the period of dissolution takes an equal length of time. This is a very long period of time. And, keeping it in mind the returning from liberation cannot be considered similar to either rebirth or the puranic conception of heaven. Sankhya philosophy, too, does not believe that the period of liberation is infinite.[72] In his commentary on this aphorism of Sankhya philosophy, Vijyan Bhikshu explicitly states that the bonds of a purusha are never completely destroyed.[73] In our opinion, if Swami Dayananda's conception of the soul is accepted as tenable, then the fact of return from liberation stands established of itself. And we find that on this issue Swamiji's view is both scientific and logically beyond criticism. Hence we must accept his point of view.

Upanishads on return from salvation—Now we would like to examine the issue from the scriptures, as to whether this view of Dayananda is found in the Upanishads. We find that there are many shruti in the Upanishads which advocate Dayananda's view point. But on the other hand there are certain statements in them which apparently refute this view. It is only after proper and careful examination of such shruti, we will be able to discern their real contention. The Upanishads state clearly that, "those who know wisely and worship with faith are enlightened and then attain Brahman, from where they never return."[74] "The person who has attained Brahman earns eternal peace."[75] The same thought is repeated in the Gita, where it is stated "Oh Arjuna, once (a being) has attained me, there is no rebirth."[76] In his "Satyarth Prakash", Swamiji refers to this in form of a dialogue in which the speaker raises the question : "न च पुनरावर्तते न च पुनरावर्तते" (Ch. U. 8. 15.1) and "अनावृत्तिः शब्दात् अनावृत्तिः शब्दात्" (V. Su. 4: 4. 22). These sentences give a clear decision against regeneration. In answer to this, Dayananda refers to many other Vedic and Upanishadic statements, but he does not elucidate the concept of regeneration by commenting on these statements. This may lead the scholars to wonder that there must be some points in the Upanishads and philosophic systems where the concept of regeneration after liberation has not been accepted. We

would like to clarify at this point that the forementioned statements do not actually refute this conception. Chandogya Upanishad states on this subject, "स खल्वेवं वर्तयन्यावदायुषं ब्रह्मलोकमभिसम्पद्य ते न च पुनरावर्तते न च पुनरावर्तते", (Ch. U. 8. 15) which can be translated thus : "he who conducts himself thus, remains in Brahman (salvation), upto the age or period (आयुपर्यन्त) and does not return." In the above quoted statement, the term upto the age (यावदायुषं) has been used to refer to the period that the liberated soul spends in the regions of Brahman. Swami Shankracharya's commentary on this statement is also quite similar. He says that, "(the soul) reaches the region of Brahman (ब्रह्मलोक) through worship and other good deeds and then he remains in that state as long as the period itself lasts; he does not return before the period of that region itself." From this it appears that Shanakara accepted the view that Brahmaloka, the region of Brahman in which the liberated soul has its existence, has a specific period. It is our opinion that these statements do not, in fact, raise any question about the period of Brahmaloka because Brahman is infinite. Besides, salvation means that the soul becomes established in Brahman, and this means that the soul reaches the region of Brahman. Hence this region is always in existence. On the other hand, the jiva does return from this region when the period of his liberation ends. It is because of this that the term "yavadayusham" has been used to indicate the period of liberation in the forementioned shruti. The meaning of the above mentioned Vedant Sutra is, in this context, also the same. Just as the shruti ordains the coming back at the expiry of period, the aphorism also accepts it. In other words, the shruti accepts that liberated soul does not come back till the period of salvation in the same manner Vedant-sutra also accept the coming back after the end of the period of salvation. The question now is : What is the period of liberation ? This is answered in the Mundakopanishad, "ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृताः परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे।" 3. 2. 6, meaning that liberated souls live in Brahman for the period of Grand-Dissolution (परान्तकाल) or Mahakalpa and then come back. And, as already pointed out, this period is as long as the time taken by 36000 periods of creation and destruction. This is a fairly long time beyond human calculation.

DAYANANDA AND OTHER VEDIC PHILOSOPHIES

Criticism of Shankara's philosophy – Advaita Vedanta does accept the soul as an eternal entity, but only as a part of Brahman by way of reflection. It further postulates that Brahman assumes the form of the soul because of ignorance. Consequently, this sect presumes Brahman and ignorance as the two eternals. At this, Swami Dayananda raises the old and traditional issue of difference in between monism and dualism that what is maya ? According to Advaita, maya is a power of illusion which, in the form of ignorance, turns Brahman from one into many, wise into ignorant, omnipresent to limited, self-satisfied and complete to one who is desirious, from one who is free from attachment to one who is involved in attachment. Besides, the existence of the soul cannot be established unless it is presumed that ignorance distorts the true nature of Brahman. This implies that Brahman is affected by ignorance. And if He possesses ignorance, it can be objected, as Swami Dayananda does that, "If you assume that infinite and eternal ignorance co-exists with Brahman in His one region, it will be impossible to accept that Brahman is pure. If it is presumed that ignorance exists in one place of Brahman, this implies that ignorance being limited will wander from one portion to another in Brahman. Consequently wherever the ignorance will go, the Brahman existing there would become ignorant, while the place that it vacates will become enlightened, therefore, it will be impossible to say that the Brahman of any place is perfect, omniscient and omnipotent."[77] If the Vedantists contradict this argument by saying that since ignorance exists in one part of Brahman and thus there is no question of Brahman Himself being ignorant. Swamiji replies, "whole Brahman should become ignorant and pained if ignorance and pain exist in any one part of Him."[78] Will such a contention not vitiate the very character of Brahman ?

Advaita philosophers equate ignorance with false knowledge. The question is : In what does ignorance subsist ? If it is answered that it subsists in Brahman, it implies that Brahman is ignorant. If it is suggested that it subsists in the jiva, this involves the fallacy of interdependence, since jiva is itself the product of ignorance. Before being distorted by ignorance, the jiva was identical with Brahman. Hence, such an argument implies that the jiva subsists in ignorance, and ignorance subsists in the soul,

which involves the fallacy of interdependence. Besides, the second question is : Is ignorance a substance or an attribute ? If it is a substance, the non-dualistic conception is destroyed, since two entities become eternal. And, if it is an attribute, then what is that substance of which it is an attribute ? Maya, being the power of illusion and of the nature of ignorance, cannot be the attribute of Brahman. If the Vedantists counter this by saying that maya is both truth and falsehood, this involves a contradiction, since nothing can be true and false or existent and non-existent, simultaneously. And, if it is presumed that maya is indescribable because it is existent and non-existent both, then it becomes similar to Brahman since in Shankara's conception, Brahman Himself is beyond truth and falsehood and consequently indescribable or indeterminable. Will this not constitute a refutation of the principle of maya ? Shankaracharya himself could not provide any satisfactory answer to these questions and the truth of the matter is that he evaded the questions by declaring maya as being indeterminable. Thus, this attitude was used as a shield to protect himself from the insuperable objections of the critics of Vedanta philosophy. And consequently, we can express the facts of case in the words of Dr. Radhakrishnan, "Shankara's view seems to be a finished example of learned error."[79]

Advaita philosophers argue that just as the moon's reflection in the water does not vitiate the moon in any way, just as millions of distinct reflections of the sun can be seen in a million pots filled with water and their destruction does destroy the reflections without damaging the sun, in the same way Brahman is reflected in the conscience, but this does not imply that Brahman is either ignorant or full of distortion. Swami Dayananda's refutation of this Vedantist thesis is that, "these similes are meaningless because both the sun and the pots of water have definite forms. The sun is distinct from the pots of water as these are distinct from the sun and that is why a reflection arises."[80] His contention is that only an object possessing form can give rise to a reflection, not a formless entity. Besides, the reflector and reflected object must be two distinct objects, whereas in Vedantic thought, Brahman is a single entity which is devoid of form. Swamiji goes on to argue, "Because the Parameshwar

is without form and all-pervasive like the sky, no substance is separate from Brahman and also cannot be one on the basis of their being pervader and pervaded. And if only one entity exists, then this relationship of pervader and pervaded cannot come into existence."[81] If the Vedantists argue that Brahman and jiva are identical on the basis of adjunct of internal-organ (antahakarana upadhi), Swami Dayananda answers, "Your argument is like that of a child. The internal-organ is changeable and made of constituents, while Brahman is without change and one. If you refuse to accept the separate existence of the jiva and Brahman, you must explain why the internal-organ, when it moves from one point to another, would not render the Brahman of that place ignorant. Just as an umbrella darkens out the place it goes and does not interrupt the flow of light from the sky where it is not situated, in the same way, the internal-organ will constantly change the Brahman from wise to ignorant, from free to bound."[82] Besides, in this philosophy, it is difficult to establish memory because whatever is observed and heard by the jiva at one place, will not be remembered by the jiva of another point in space. If this is countered by the argument that Brahman being one will be able to remember, Dayananda counters it by suggesting that, in that case, if ignorance and pain exist at any one place in Brahman, then whole of Brahman must suffer by ignorance and pain."[83] But reality does not support such a contention. One person does not feel the sufferings of another. Again if the Advaita concept of adjunct of internal-organ is accepted, the question is whether pain and pleasure are experienced by the internal-organ or the Brahman who is all-pervasive. The internal-organ is inert so there can be no question of pleasure or pain in it. Now, since the sole entity left is Brahman, it will become necessary to presume (arthapatti), that it is Brahman who experiences pain and pleasure. Such a conception will destroy His purity and perfection. Besides, Shankara believes the ignorance is infinite, eternal and natural or by-itself.[84] From this, it is inferred that ignorance has existed since eternity and shall continue to exist into the infinite future and also that it is natural. But the point is : whose nature is it ? If it is answered that it is an attribute of the jiva, then there is no question of its disappearance (tirobhava), since ignorance is

his own attribute and thus all the Vedic mantras that speak of salvation are reduced to nonsense. If it is suggested that it is not an attribute of the jiva, but natural in relation to whole (samishtirupa), while it is destructible in its individual (vyashti) aspect and thus the soul can obtain salvation. On this, the dualist says that in your opinion when internal-organ moves to another place in Brahman, the previous Brahman covered by internal organ, will get liberation and in this way liberation will become automatic and easily available. The Vedantists may contend that salvation implies the destruction of adjunct. Then the entire argument becomes a foolish controversy, because the Shruti speaks of the salvation only of that being who experiences pain and pleasure. The internal-organ is an inert substance and the Brahman by residing in it takes on the form of the jiva or soul and feels pleasure and pain **and hence, according to the Advaita view, all that is being discussed, is the salvation of Brahman.** Acharaya Shankara declares that the Supreme Being Himself appears to be fascinated by His own power of maya. The entire Advaita argument thus turns round the bondage and salvation of Brahman Himself and this is contrary both to reason and all that is said in the Shruti.

Shankaracharya takes shelter behind some of the shrutis in the Upanishads which seem to support an Advaita view, but wherever he finds it logically insupportable, he turns round and asks how those shrutis or statements which support monism are to be interpreted if the dualistic view is to be propounded [85] He overcomes this objection by contending that the mantras suggestive of dualism pertain to the empirical level, not to the transcendental level. But in our opinion, the Upanishads nowhere suggest any such division. The fact is that every commentator, in his drive to interpret the Upanishadic and Vedic mantras in the light of his own viewpoint, completely overlooks the real intent. The Upanishads contain statements which support both dualism and non-dualism. In the same way, the description of creation and character of jiva, that these texts provide, is so realistic in nature which any protagonist of illusion theory i.e. mayavad cannot do. For the seers of the Upanishads, the world is entirely real, that the jiva is an entity distinct from Brahman and this is what Swami Dayananda has accepted. Paramatma, being even more

subtle than the jiva, pervades the jiva and they both meet in the deepest core of the heart.[86]

We find a new kind of non-dualism in the theory of difference-non-difference (भेदाभेदवाद) advocated by Bhaskaracharaya and Nimbarka. Their view is that the jiva is not distinct from Brahman, but is only a part of it, just as the sparks that fly out from a fire are themselves fire, not different from it. Swami Dayananda cannot accept this conception because if the jiva is a part of Brahman, it must be accepted that Brahman has parts. If he does not have parts, then the analogy between the fire and Brahman is unsuitable. And on the other hand, to accept that Brahman has parts automatically implies accepting that He is changeable and thus subject to destruction. This means that Brahman is not truth, eternal and omniscient.

Vallabhacharya in his pure-monism declares the jiva to be eternal, but he does not accept the jiva as distinct from Brahman. In His existence as the jiva, Brahman only suppresses his own blissfulness, whereas truth and consciousness survive. Nimbarka suggests that jiva is only a part of Brahman and contends that ignorance is an attribute or nature of the jiva.[87] Ramanuja accepts the jiva as eternal, but as an attribute and body of Brahman. He also does not distinguish between the Brahman and jiva. The distinction between the two is that of internal-difference (स्वगत-भेद). In this view the jiva is a part of Brahman, but the nature of the two differs from each other. The jiva is not a part of Brahman in the sense of being one of His constituents, because Brahman is without constituents, but in the sense that it is the effect of Brahman, because the soul cannot exist apart from Brahman. But again the soul is not like an effect arising from Brahman.[88] Ramanuja's view is clearly confused. The reason behind this is that Ramanuja did not want to become a phenomenalist (Brahamavadi) like Shankara, but on the other hand he wanted to accomodate the Upanishadic statements appeared to be advocating monism in the litral sense of non-dualism. Ramanuja niether had the courage to accept, like Bhaskara that the jiva is a part of Brahman, nor the determination to abandon the non-dualistic standpoint, as Swami Dayananda did. Swami Dayananda does not tie the soul's existence to that of Brahman, but instead postulates that the jiva

is as eternal as Brahman. In Dayananda's philosophy, there are no distinctions in Brahman unlike Ramanuja who believes in internal difference.

Almost all the foregoing philosophers have written their commentaries on Vedanta philosophy. Swami Dayananda did not write any commentary on the Brahma-Sutra. But he has included some of its aphorisms in his "Satyarth Prakash". Swami Dayananda perceives that both Vedanta and Upanishads support the view of a dualism between Brahman and the jiva. He writes that if the Vedanta aphorisms had not mentioned this dualism and distinction, then the following aphorisms—'नेतरोऽनुपपत्तेः' (V. Su. 1 1. 16). 'भेदव्यपदेशाच्च' - (V. Su. 1. 1. 17) would not have spoken of the absence of bliss in the jiva or of the inability of the jiva to create the universe."[89] Whether there is dualism in Vedanta or not is obvious from the fact that if Vedanta philosophy had supported Brahmavada, there would have been no need for Ramanuja, Vallabha, Nimbaraka and other philosophers to compose commentaries on the Brahma-Sutras to counter monism of Shankara. Vedanta philosophy does not give even an inkling of maya or illusion theory.

Shankara himself becomes conscious of a profound doubt and strong misgivings when he comes across aphorisms in the Brahma-Sutras which suggested the distinction between Brahman, jiva and prakrati and establish their real and separate existence. On such occasions, Shankara dismisses them in his commentary as belonging to the practical level. This is astonishing in view of the multiplicity of aphorisms in the Vedanta which declare again and again that the jiva and this universe are real. Even in salvation, the jiva does not have the power to create, which is what the Vedanta declares.[90] Shankara's own commentary on this point declares that even in salvation, the jiva cannot interfere in creation. The question is : Once the jiva's ignorance is abolished and the jiva has obtained true knowledge of his being Brahman, why can he still not participate in creation ? Vedanta does not give this power to the jiva because it assumes that he is devoid of the requisite capability. Besides, the liberated souls enjoy bliss through their power of determination (sankalp-sharira)[91] If Vedanta had accepted identification of the liberated soul with Brahman, there would have been no need for this determination power. This indicates that Vedanta accepts the distinction between Brahman and jiva and that Swami Dayananda's view is closer to that of ancient Vedic literature than that of other philosophers.

6
MATTER

Reality of the World

Materialist Philosophy—The atomistic theories of the Greek philosophers Democritus and Leucippus are possibly among the earliest materialistic systems of thought. According to them, the creation of the universe, living and non-living both, is the result of subtle, spherical and dynamic atoms. The qualitative difference between the living and the non-living world is merely an apparent difference, but since they arise from the same cause, there is no elemental difference between them. Such concepts as the soul's immortality and the purpose of creation are imaginary and illusory notions, whereas in fact, the entire universe is directed in its activity by natural laws. These principles outlined by Leucippus were later highly elaborated by Epicurus and Lucretius.

In the modern age, this atomistic view obtained massive support from science. Discoveries in the field of physics have established that the entire universe is a construct of three elements—electron, neutron and proton. Atoms, too, are only varied combinations of these elements. Most modern materialists are evolutionists who believe that along with the material substances of this universe, life itself has evolved from matter. Materialism finds support from every new discovery of science. He says that we (materialists) have split the atom today and tomorrow, we shall explain the emergence of life from these physical elements also. Materialism firmly believes that matter is everything and there is no place for supra-physical entities such as the soul or God.

REPUDIATION OF IDEALISM

The second major concept regarding the existence of the world is that of Idealism, which is precisely opposite of materialism. While materialism believes that the spiritual element

consciousness originates from matter, the idealists believe that the entire world has originated from a conscious entity. In order to save spiritual elements from being explained away in materialistic terms, the idealists contend that matter is a distortion of the soul or God and thus destroy the substantial aspect of matter. In contrast, the materialists, in order to protect the reality of matter, refute the existence of any spiritual entity. The idealists treat matter as a mental aberration or manifestation. Idealism implies that the concrete, manifest universe is not fundamentally different from mental concepts and also that no concrete matter is necessary for the creation of the universe. There need not be any matter existing a priori.

Plato—Plato was a Greek (Unani) philosopher and a disciple of Socrates. Concerning the existence of the world, he postulated that whatever we perceive outside ourselves is not real, but only a reflection of the reality. The substances of this world are only partial and incomplete imitations of some true Ideas. The real substance is an idea of substance, which exists in the world of ideas. According to Plato, man and manness are two distinct entities and man's death does not imply the death of manness. The idea of manness exists in heaven and it is immortal. On the basis of this idea and in its form, men are created on this earth. Every object has its idea. Plato sometimes designates these ideas as divine or Godly ideas. In his philosophy, the idea in its form is universal and the things created after it are particulars. Hence, manness is the general while man is its particular. All that we wish to infer from Plato's philosophy in this context is that he denies the real existence of the external world and postulates that it is only a reflection of the world of universals created by God.

Evaluation of Plato's thought—Plato separated the universal from the particular in such a way that the two could never meet. Plato's concept of the universal is not merely an idea in thought or mental impression, but is an object which can be cognized. Another major drawback of Platonic thought is that he conceives of ideas both as being created by God and also infinite. Russell has pointed to this inherent contradiction in Plato's thought. Russell objects that ideas cannot be created by God if they are infinite or eternal. Secondly, even God cannot create the idea

man unless there is such a concept or idea already in existence and this idea can be obtained only from Plato's idea man. Russell goes on to argue that eternal substances are never created, it is only the world limited by time and space that can be created. Plato's philosophy treats the apparent world as illusory and defective. This implies that the creator has created illusion and sin. The obvious question is : Why did God choose to create this illusory world ? Was He not satisfied with the universe of true ideas i.e. substances ?

The Platonic gulf between the universal and the particular emerged as a critique of this philosophy in Aristotle's thought. Aristotle believes that both the universal and the particular exist in this world and further argues that the two are not separate. Plato accepts the reality of substance, but he does not clearly explains it. He declares that the God simply rearranged the universe when he found it full of chaos and disorder. As Russell has explained, "thus it appears that Plato's God unlike the Jewish and Christian God did not create the world out of nothing, but rearranged pre-existing matter."[1] Despite his acceptance of the reality of matter, Plato's philosophy cannot be considered realistic because, in his view, the real material out of which the universe is created is idea, which leaves its impression upon matter. Plato views the perceptible world as a reflection.

Swami Dayananda's philosophy does not envisage the theory of two worlds as Plato does. If Plato's universals can be equated with the eternal laws of nature subsisting in divine knowledge in the form of cosmic law (*rita*), Swami Dayananda can accept them, but in that case Plato's conception of two distinct worlds cannot be sustained. The reason is that, in Plato's views, the world which is experienced is unreal while the universe beyond experience and action is real. Dayananda is not prepared for this. Swami Dayananda holds to the view that irrespective of whether human beings live or die, whether any part of this world is perceived or not, whether men have knowledge of any activity in the world or not, the existence of the world remains unaffected.

Berkeley—The most consistent and powerful attack upon the materialist philosophy has been the idealism of Berkeley. His philosophy destroys the very existence of matter. In his philo-

sophy, there is no such entity as matter. Instead, he says that the very existence of objets depends upon our perception of them. In his view, when we perceive any object, that is the result of the sensations of our mind which we peroeive in the shape of objects of external world. In fact, nothing exists apart from our sensations. On this there can be a question that : how do those objects exist which are not perceived by any one ? Berkeley's answer is that such objects exist in the mind of God. If we compare this view with Shankara's philosophy, it is like this, that individual ignorance (व्यष्टि अविद्या) becomes the cause of the world perceived by the soul while maya (समष्टि अविद्या) becomes the cause of the entire universe, which God creates.

Evaluation of Berkeley's philosophy—Berkeley's argument in support of his idealism, is, that whenever we perceive a thing we perceive it through the sensations and since these sensations exist in our mind, therefore, objects are not independent of our mind. Berkeley's views are based on this illogical argument (I) mental ideas do not exist outside the mind, (2) the knowledge of objects as they are perceived consists of mental ideas (3) therefore, objects do not exist outside the mind. The fallacy of this argument is that it has identified the objects with the mental ideas, by confusedly using the word idea, in two distinct connotations, first as the process of knowledge and secondly as the object. C. E. M. Joad points out, "But the objects of an act of thought can never be the same as the act of thought of which it is 'an object'."[2] It is a serious error to identify the object with the act of thought. Consequently, Berkeley's view is contrary both to practical experiences as well as rational conception. Another question that can be asked is : Since every mind is a world in itself, then why are the sensations of almost everyone more or less the same, despite the wide difference found between the thoughts, ideas and desires of different persons ? Besides, why do we not create a universe according to our own preferences and why are we compelled by the pressures of the environment to crush or suppress our desires ? If we ourselves are the creators of our own world, then why do we not create a universe of our own choice and thus escape despair and frustration ? In addition, why does not an object change its form, despite our wishing ever so desparately that it should do so ? If this is countered by

the argument that all objects exist in God's mind, then one must ask whether God Himself is not an idea of our mind, which is precisely what Hume did when he took Berkeley's argument to its logical conclusion. Again, would it not be a grave error to accept other souls as equal to ourselves, when these beings, too, are mere ideas of our mind ? Thus, if this philosophy is accepted, the entire universe, including God and souls, is reduced to an idea. This is the conclusion that Hume drew from Berkeley's argument and in doing so it was not an error on his part, since this is the logical culmination of Berkeley's philosophy and of the empiricism whose seeds are found in the philosophy of Descartes and which was later employed so enthusiastically by Locke and subsequently by Berkeley.

Idealism in Indian Philosophy—In the sphere of Indian philosophical thought, **Shankara's Advaita philosophy is also idealistic.** He believes that Brahman alone is true. In his opinion existence of the universe, that is, the dualism of the conscious and the unconscious is only an illusion, that ontologically there is only non-dualism. In order to explicate the illusory nature of this universe, Shankara takes recourse to various similes. He sometimes defines it as the expression of magical power of the magician and says that it is exactly like the magician who appears sometimes to fly into the sky and sometimes to descend to the earth, without in fact going anywhere. Sometimes he turns to the simile which expresses transformation theory (parinamvada) and says that the world which is like the foam on the sea, has been created out of the matter in the form of Brahman.[3] It appears that Shankara found it difficult to cling to pure idealism (vivartavda) and consequently, he sometimes turned to the similes indicative of transformation theory (parinamvada).[4] But he did not accept that any transformation occurs in Brahman (brahma-parinama). There are many places in the Shruti where the mantras appear to be supporting the philosophy of Brahman-transformation (brahma-parinamvada) and these Shankara interprets in consonance with transformation concept (parinamvada). Consequently, in his writings about the universe, one finds glimpses of both transformation (parinamvada) and perversion (vivartavada). It appears that his philosophy was profoundly

influenced by Mandukya-karika of Gaudpada, in which the existence of the world has been described as a pure illusion. His own commentaries on this book also indicate that Shankara treats the world as the illusion created by a magician. Consequently, he propagates the notion that Brahman alone is true. In determining the nature of the world in Shankara's philosophy, we get considerable assistance from the scholars who succeeded him. Their ideas will be considered after studying Buddhist thought. At this point, it is necessary to understand the idealism of the Buddhists in order to understand Shankara's philosophy, because most of his thought was deeply influenced by the nihilism (shunyavada) of Buddhism.

The Buddhist scholar Nagarjuna and Chandrakirti hold that knowledge is that of two kinds--conventional or wordly knowledge (*lok-samvrati*) and transcendental (parmarthic) knowledge. Nagarjuna declares in his "Madhyamika-karika" that in Buddhist philosophy, there are two kinds of truth, one that is covered by ignorance called *Samvrati* truth, it is based on the common intellect and second, transcendental (parmarthic) truth, which is *absolute*. The term *samvrati* means '*covered.*' Chandrakirti declares that it is covered by ignorance on all sides.[5] This universe of causal relations, in which the effect is dependent upon its cause, in which the reality of any substance can never be known, appears to proceed through conjunction and disjunction (sanyog-viyog). **The truth is so covered by ignorance that reality cannot be discovered. It is this veil of ignorance which** has been referred to as "*lok samvrati.*" However, it has also been distinguished from '*mithya samvrati*' i. e. perversion of worldly knowledge, which is the name given to illusory cognition, such as, illusion of snake in rope. They further say that falsity of such an illusory cognition can be discerned in the world itself. In Nagarjuna's view the world of perception or *lok samvrati* is only true as compared to this kind of false perception, but in reality, it is also not true. He declares explicitly that the existence of the world is similar to a mirage or a dream.[6] A base is needed to which a false perception can be attributed, for instance, a rope is needed to impose the false perception of a snake. But Buddhist philosophy does not provide for any such permanent entity on the basis of which an illusory universe can

be imposed. It is only at this point that Shankara and the Buddhists differ from each other. Shankara believes that the perceived world is an illusion which is an imposition on Brahman. It is Brahman who is the basis of world illusion, just as the piece of rope gives rise to the impression of a snake.[7] However, this concept cannot turn Shankara's philosophy into a realistic one, because the Brahman of his conception is indeterminable and unchangeable thought. He cannot be the material cause of the universe in the sense of real transformation. In his commentary on karika 1-17 of the Gaudpadiya Karika, Shankara has described the world as an illusion similar to the illusion or maya created by the magician. In his view, the ultimate truth is only one and that is unchangeable Brahman.[8] The illusoriness of the world has been more or less similarly elaborated by the nihilists as well as Shankara. The sole distinction between the two is that while Shankara believes in Brahman as the basis of world illusion, the nihilists deny even this basis. For buddhist *sunya* or void is the only truth.

In Shankara's Vedanta philosophy, 'maya', ignorance or false cognition is such an entity which 'is' and 'is not', yet beyond this it is indescribable. This indescribable (*anirvachaniya*), character of maya, created a major problem for the later Vedanta philosophers and made it difficult for them to interpret 'maya'. In their attempt to define maya, they also had to take great care to ensure that their elaboration must not demolish Shankara's basic contention that only Brahman is true, while the world is false. Shankara's direct disciple, Padampada (820 A.D) defined maya as the power of ignorance which is an inert substance. The illusory world is created out of this substance, which is like a seed, thus implying that it is the material cause of the world. This lifeless power of ignorance lives in the pure soul and on the one hand, hides from Him his own true nature, which is in reality Brahman and on the other hand, converts itself into various mental forms such as the ego.[9] It should be kept in mind that here although this ignorance is indeterminable, but it is unlike the ignorance of Buddhist, which is equivalent to a false perception. It is the material of the world. Prakashatman (1200 A. D.) also accepts maya as the material of the world and regards it as the material cause of the world, but he further argues that being dependent upon Brahman, it is not distinct from Brahman. It

is not distinct from Brahman in this sense that he refers to Brahman as both efficient and material cause (abhninnimitopadan) of the world.[10] Vachaspati Misra declares that both Brahman and maya are jointly the material cause of the world.[11] Sri Appya Dixit makes one cistinction in this, i. e. that the consciousness in the universe is due to Brahman while lifelessness is due to maya. Sarvagyatama Muni wants to make Brahman the only real material cause of the world, in which maya is the efficient cause. He did not want to give as much importance to maya as to Brahman in the manifestation of this universe.[12]

The wide variety of interpretations attached to the word 'maya' within the range of a single philosophical system indicates the complex nature of the concept. Such complexity is inevitable if the world is accepted as an illusion under this philosophy of maya. Acharya Shankara failed to clarify the nature of maya and its relationship with the world and the transcendental reality. Possibly, it was not so significant as it became later on. All later commentators, declared in clear terms that Brahman is the material cause of the world, but simultaneously felt hesitation in describing the universe as an illusion. Despite this, they do not want to deflect from Shankara's philosophy any way. Consequently, while one commentator refers to maya as the inert power of ignorance, another speaks of it as the power of Brahman. However, all are agreed that maya is ignorance which hides the truth from us and becomes the cause of false cognition in truth. Prakashatman goes so far as to declare, according to Dass Gupta, that every jiva has its own world of illusion, therefore, the world does not disappear at the abolition of individual ignorance of one jiva. Because then the ignorance persists with other jivas.[13]

SWAMI DAYANANDA'S REALISM

Swami Dayananda holds firmly to the view that any philosophy seeking to prove the world an illusion is completely contrary to the Vedic tradition. He says, "it is entirely wrong to declare that, that which is directly obtainable is false or nonexisting in the present and that its most subtle cause is also nonexistent."[14] He then declares that it is improper to call the world unreal by comparing it to a dream. He says, "those who call the world imaginary like a dream or an illusion comparable to the illusion

of a snake in a rope, argue ineffectually since imagination is an attribute." "A dream can never occur without first seeing and hearing. Direct contact with and perception of true and existing substances in the waking state creates impressions, in other words, their cognitions live in the soul in the form of impressions and in a dream we perceive only these impressions."[15] Dayananda believes that the perceptual world is real and its ultimate cause prakrati is eternal. In his view, "just as external objects continue to exist despite their absence in deep sleep (Sushupti), the matter which is the cause of the universe continues to exist even in a state of dissolution."[16] He opines that Brahman can never be both efficient and material cause of the world. He argues that the attributes of material cause come in its effect. In other words, one must either accept that inertness etc., which are attributes of the world, are also attributes of Brahman, or provide a rational explanation of the inertness in the universe and demonstrate its cause. He argues that Vedantic philosophers cannot explain this by assuming Brahman to be the both efficient and material cause of the world.

Shankara himself and his later disciples got enmeshed in the riddle of the maya to such an extent that their writings began to contradict each other. Shankara and Prakashatman declare that the world is an illusion which the jiva, due to his ignorance, imposes upon Brahman, just as one perceives the snake in a rope. On the other hand, when Shankara himself states in his commentary on the Vedanta that even liberated souls do not have the right to interfere in the creation of the universe, it appears that the observable world has, in fact, been created. But, contrary to this, Shankara does not accept that the world was actually created.[17] His view is that the existence of the world is only a practical reality. Dayananda suggests that advaita philosophers have variously and incoherently defined maya sometimes as ignorance, sometimes as a magical power and at other times either as a power that creates an illusion or a prakrati possessed of three gunas. He thus concludes that it was entirely inappropriate for Shankara to hold, first that maya is the power of illusion and then to call it prakrati which has three gunas.

In Dayananda's view, the existence of the observable world is entirely beyond doubt. It is the true transformation of a real prakrati and its existence is not dependent, in any way, upon the thinking of mental impression of either jiva or Brahman. Neither is it a distortion of Paramatma, as Bhaskara claims. Nor, as Shankara suggests can the world be called maya, an entity which can neither be defined nor has any basis. Dayananda's view of prakrati is that it is an entity possessed of three gunas, which is also the Sankhya view. It is not the magician's power of magic, which sometimes appears to some indologists. It is also unlike the true, existing prakrati of Vigyan Bikshu's conception, which is both an entity with three gunas and also a power of Brahman, which, in a state of dissolution, identifies itself with Brahman and thus loses its existence. It is also not an attribute of the Absolute, as Spinoza argued. Dayananda explains that prakrati is real and the world being its transformation, is also real. All the substances of the world are true and they are subject to change. According to the Buddhist conception of momentariness (*shanikvada*), a substance is destroyed every moment and created a new in every next moment of time. It is a view which does not accept the real existence of any substance. In contrast, Dayananda believes that matter, which is the basis of change, is a true, eternal entity. The conjunction and disjunction of subtle parts of matter create new objects, but the matter in itself is indestructible and unchangeable. Dayananda can accept the Buddhist concept of momentariness, if it refers to the changeability of this world of name and forms. And it is possible that Mahatma Buddha's declaration "*All is momentary*", meant no more than this. **By accepting the existence of matter as true, Swami Dayananda opens the way for scientific research.** He does not hesitate in the least to accept their discoveries and inventions. A true philosopher does not violate the limits of science, but he also does not allow science to proceed beyond its frontiers, because his mind contains knowledge not only of material elements but also supra-physical spiritual truths. By accepting prakrati as real, Dayananda does not become a naturalist also. It is both false and illogical to assume that anyone who accepts the reality of matter is a materialist. Berkeley's idealism was based on precisely this misconception and false notion that by accepting the reality of matter one becomes materialist. And if

we accept materialism, says Berkeley, the very conception of Bible that God created the world out of nothing i. e. without any matter, will fall to ground. Being a priest himself, Berkeley considered it his duty to strengthen the foundations of Christian belief in any manner and disprove the science which struck at the roots of Christian theology. As has been pointed out, "He (Berkeley) believed that his denial of existence of material substance enabled materialism, scepticism and atheism to be refuted and the cause of religion to be more firmly established than hitherto."[18] Even Shankara himself, when rendered answerless by logical criticism offered by his opponents, turned to the Shruti for support. If confronted with any Vedic shruti ordaining dualism, he then took recourse to those shrutis which preached non-dualism apparently and argued that if dualism was accepted as correct, how would you interpret those shrutis which teach non-dualism ? In our view, any attempt to establish the meaning of any one statement by arguing illogically and unscientifically, manifests the weakness of one's own system of thought.

In order to avoid the illusory character of the world Ramanuja was compelled to postulate that prakrati is real. But, at the same time, the overwhelming desire to provide a suitable explanation of the Upanishadic statements pertaining to non-dualism, compelled him to have recourse to a special form of non-dualism. In his view, both prakrati and jiva are equally the bodies of Brahman. In fact, prakrati, which is a substance, is the material cause of the world, while Brahman is its efficient cause. From this, Ramanuja deduced that the perceptual world is real and not merely an illusion. The fact that prakrati is Brahman's body while Brahman is an entity which possesses a body makes Brahman both efficient and material cause of the world. He declares that such a contention does not transgress the purity of Brahman, in the same way as bodily changes do not influence the soul. In his view, Brahman remains unaffected by worldly activities. In this philosophy, God lives in the world inherently.

In criticism of this philosophy, it can be objected that the soul and the body are two distinct entities. The wise man never regards them as one. It is only the ignorant who, disregarding

the distinction between the living and the non-living, regard the body as the soul. What is the purpose of considering prakrati and jiva as the body of Brahman ? Since no one can accept the transformations of prakrati as the distrotions of Brahman, then how can Brahman become both efficient and material cause of the world ? Prakrati is the material cause and not Brahman. Brahman should be distinguished from prakrati, just as the body and the soul, two distinct elements with different attributes, are distinct from each other.

Understanding the validity and import of such objections and observing the realism propagated in Vedic mantras, Swami Dayananda clearly stated that prakrati is an eternal element. His realism is not a qualified realism like Ramanuja. His philosophy is clearly a theory of three eternals (*traitvad*), in which Brahman, jiva and prakrati are three eternal elements and the world a reality, not an illusion.

Dayananda's Conception of Prakrati

द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्ष परिषस्वजाते ।
तयोरन्य: पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्यनश्नन्नन्यो अभि चाकशीति ।।

Rigveda I. 164. 2

"Brahman and the jiva, both are eternal, both are alike in consciousness and such other attributes and united by the relationship of the pervader and the pervaded and existing in mutual friendship. Similar to them is the eternal first cause prakrati, which is comparable to a tree as the cause and with its branches, which are as its effects. In other words, it is the matter which gets scattered at the time of dissolution. This third eternal substance, different from the first two, is prakrati. The deeds and attributes and nature of these three are also eternal. Of the Brahman and jiva, one is the jiva which fully experiences the fruits of his vice and virtue in this world, which is similar to the tree While the second is Brahman, which does not experience or taste of these fruits and it pervades and enlightens everything from inside as well as outside. The jiva is different from God and God from the jiva and prakrati from both of them. Each one of them is eternal".[19]

We have already stated earlier in this chapter that Swami Dayananda does not accept the principle of maya and its corol-

lary that the world is an illusion Similarly, Bhaskara's theory of Brahma-Parinamavada also does not appear to him to be a true representative of the Vedic philosophy, because Brahman is truth, bliss and consciousness and perfect. He has no desire. Then why would He convert Himself into the ignorant jiva and this universe. Besides, Bhaskara himself cannot suitably answer the query why the infinite and omniscient Brahman should convert Himself into the jiva and thus become finite instead of infinite, atomic in the place of all-pervasive, ignorant in place of pure consciousness and would become the three gunas of inert prakrati when He is beyond them. It was because of this objection that Ramanuja conceived of prakrati as an eternal element, but he modified it by postulating that prakrati is the body of Brahman.

Swami Dayananda states in the most explicit terms that prakrati is the ultimate material cause of the universe.[20] Brahman is the efficient cause of the universe, while prakrati is the material cause. Dayananda advances the argument that the effect possesses attributes similar to those of its cause, because of which Brahman cannot be the material cause of the universe. He reasons that Brahman is invisible, while the universe is observable, Brahman is indivisible while the universe is divisible since it is obviously made up of parts. And if the effects like earth are supposed to have evolved from Brahman, then Dayananda argues, the inertness of earth should be accepted to exist in Brahman. Then Brahman would become inert like earth etc.[21]

God creates the universe in the begining of '*Kalpa*' from the eternal matter (*prakrati*). Prakrati remains existent in an extremely subtle form in a state of chaos, but it is neither destroyed nor merged in Brahman. As the material cause of the universe, it is dependent upon Brahman. If Brahman, as the efficient cause of the universe, were not to transform prakrati into universe, prakrati itself would not be capable of giving rise to the universe. This implies that in order to be transformed into an effect, it is dependent upon Brahman, just as clay depends upon the potter to be transformed as a pot or other utensils, but the clay does not depend upon the potter for its existence. In the same way, prakrati in its original form is not dependent upon Brahman for its existence, instead, it is eternal. According to

Dayananda, prakrati is the power (*samarthya*) of Brahman, just as wealth is the power of the wealthy individual, who can use his wealth in any way he chooses, but he does not himself become wealth and neither does he possess any of the natural attributes of wealth itself. Prakrati, too, is neither an imposition (adhyasa) upon Brahman nor His transformation. Swamiji accepts that Brahman, being more subtle than both the jiva and prakrati, pervades both of them, just as fire, being subtle than iron, pervades the latter. Commenting upon an Upanishadic mantra, Swami Dayananda explains, "one is pervader and the other is post-pervader. Now God is like the post-pervader who enters within the souls—who enter the body—and reveals the knowledge of name and form through the Veda".[22] Brahman pervades prakrati and transforms it into different forms.

Swamiji turns to the Vedas, Upanishads and the six sistems of Vedic philosophy to support his theory of the three eternals. The following mantra of the Shvetashvetaropanishad,

अज मेकां लोहित शुक्ल कृष्णां वह्वी: प्रजा: सृजमाना सरूपा: ।
अजोह्येको जुषमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्यना भुक्तभोगामजोऽन्य: ।। ४·५ ।।

clearly declares the eternality of prakrati. In his commentary on it, Swami Dayananda declares, "prakrati, jiva and Parmatma, all three are eternals, in other words, they are not born."[23] One finds numerous ideas in the Upanishads which support Swami Dayananda's realistic theory. The Chandogya states, "O Shvetaketo ! Know thou water as the cause of the earth (पृथिवी) in the form of food (अन्न), fire (तेज) as the cause of water and from the effect fire, know the real matter or prakrati as the cause".[24]

"This prakrati is the first cause of the material universe. Before creation, this universe existed in prakrati in an unmanifested form".[25] "O Soma ! prakrati, which is true, existed prior to creation".[26] Upanishads also occasionally use the term 'maya'. For instance, it declares, "know the maya as prakrati and God as the magician".[27] Here, the Upanishadic seer visualizes maya as prakrati, describing it as, "there is one unborn containing three colours red, black and white".[28] He further says that "from this unborn God creates the universe, in this, there is another unborn jiva, which is found entangled in the three gunas of satva, rajas and tamas."[29]

The Brahma-Sutra are extremely close to Upanishadic philosophy. Throughout the Brahma-Sutra, the word 'maya' occurs only once, and even there, it has not been used in the sense of illusory force as Shankara has defined. Here it has been used to contradict those who try to establish similarity between waking and dreaming states. The context is that the protagonist of a dream theory says that all things in the dream exist like the things of waking world, just as in the chariot of dream the charioteer and the maker of chariot all are present. Therefore, waking world is as false as the dream.[30] Maharishi Badarayana answers this by arguing that "all this (dream) is only maya, because they (substances) are not manifested in their true form".[31] Before this, the author has already clarified that the substances of the dream world and the waking world cannot be identical, because of the difference in their nature (*vaidharmaya*).[32] Clearly, in this context, the word maya has been used as a false knowledge, which is also the contention of the mayavadins. But the author does not accept the similarity of the dreaming and waking worlds because the two have qualitative differences. One is by its very nature false, while the other is a composite truth. In view of this, the viewpoint of the philosophers of maya finds no support in Vedanta aphorisms. On the contrary, Vedant-Sutra contain numerous aphorisms stressing the reality of the universe and prakrati and the fact that God created the universe out of prakrati.[33] Here it is worth-mentioning that even Shankara comments on these aphorisms so as to prove that the universe is real, but only on practical level, which is completely inappropriate. Nowhere does the Upanishadic or Vedantic seers envisage such type of two separate levels of existence.

Swami Dayananda's conception of prakrati is very similar to the Sankhya conception. He says, "(satva) pure, (rajas) medium and (tamas) inert are the three elements which combine to form the substance known as prakrati."[34] At this point, Swami Dayananda can be labelled as an atheist, as the Sankhya thinkers were charged, because of the proximity between his conception of prakrati and that of the Sankhyas. But any such allegation is entirely untenable. First, Swami Dayananda believes that along with prakrati, Brahman and the jiva are also

eternal elemets. Secondly, in his view, Sankhya philosophy itself cannot be branded an atheistic system of thought. He rejects any such contention, a fact we have already established through rational proofs in the third chapter. Swami Shankara's main objection to Sankhya philosophy was that the process of creation cannot be set in motion by positing a purusha or jiva who is inactive and a prakrati or matter which is inert. Such an objection is regarded as sound only as long as we presume that Sankhya philosophy rejects the existence of God, where as Swami Dayananda has demonstrated on the basis of the Sankhya-sutra itself that Sankhya philosophy believes in the existence of God. Consequently, by accepting the Sankhya concept of prakrati, which they designate the 'pradhana, Swami Dayananda does not make himself deserving of the label of a materialist.

CAUSALITY

The Three Causes accepted by Swami Dayananda—Similar to the Nyaya philosophers, Swami Dayananda accepts that there are three kinds of cause. "One efficient (nimitta), second material (upadan), and third ordinary (sadharana). *Efficient cause* is that by whose action something is made and without whose action nothing can be made. Second, the *material cause* is that without which nothing can be made, that which suffers a change of form both to create and to destroy. Third, the *ordinary cause* is that which is an instrument in creation and also the ordinary efficient. Efficient causes are of two kinds. First, the main efficient cause is God, who creates, sustains and destroys the universe out of matter, and second, the ordinary efficient cause is the jiva or sonl, who, out of the substances existing in the world, creates many things. The material cause, prakrati, which is called the substance of the entire world, being inert can itself neither create or destroy anything. It can create or destroy the substances of the world with the help of some other agency He then explains, "when an object is created, then the means used in it—power, hands, various tools, space, time, and sky-are the ordinary causes."[35]

In Swami Dayananda's view, the law of causality is a universal law of creation. It is imlicit in every occurence in the world, just as the law or gravitation is found to be operative in

all the phenomena of the universe. Vaisheshika philosophy advances the opinion that the effect arises because of the cause,[36] implying that in the absence of the cause, there is an absence of effect, but the absence of the effect does not imply the absence of the cause.[37] Dayananda accepts this Vaisheshika concept without modification, arguing that the effect cannot arise without a cause, just as an earthen pot cannot exist without its material cause, the clay, or the pot may not exist if there is no potter, or even if the potter exists, the means of making a pot may not exist. Consequently, the creation of any object presupposes the existence of the material, efficient and the ordinary causes. In Dayananda's view, the universe also presupposes the existence of these three causes. In other words, prakrati is the material cause, God is the efficient cause, and time, place and the deeds of souls are the ordinary causes of the universe. At the beginning of creation, God, the efficient cause uses the previously existing matter, the material cause and time and space, the ordinary causes for creating the universe. Hence, in Dayananda's philosophy, God is not the material cause, but the efficient cause. Here Prakrati is the material cause, which is eternal.

The ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle accepted the existence of four causes behind the creation of the universe—material cause, formal cause, efficient cause, and final cause. Of these, matter is the material cause, the concept or idea of the universe is the formal cause, according to which the universe was created. God is the efficient cause who initiated and motivated the process of creation, while the final cause is the purpose behind creation the purpose for which the universe was created. Dayananda's and Aristotle's views on causality do not differ in any material respect. Aristotle's conception of the material and the efficient causes agrees perfectly with Dayananda's, while his formal cause and final cause can both be comprehended under Dayananda's conception of the ordinary cause, because Dayananda comprehends under it God's knowledge, vision, power, deeds of souls, for whose experience the universe was created.

Is the law of causality eternal ? Does every occurence in this universe necessarily have some cause behind it ? Philosophers have always been possessed of some doubt about the answers to such questions. Among British empiricists, Hume refuted the law

of causality. since he believes that there is no causal relationship among the occurences of the world, only an accidental co-existence occurs.

Hume's concept of causality as accidental occurences cannot be safely accepted. Because if it is assumed that the notion of causality has been imposed ignorantly upon accidental relationship between discrete events, it becomes difficult to answer such questions as; why dose the seed of wheat given the right conditions, invariably produce wheat and not cotton or some other plant ? Though some modern thinkers of science reject causality as an outmoded philosophical obsession, but science itself is founded on the assumption of causality Why do rockets travel along pre-determined paths and orbit in space ? This happens because scientists believe that rocket will invariably respond in a predictable way to his commands. If even this were explained as a conglomeration of accidental events, the entire edifice of science would collapse. Scientific calculations enable the scientist to predict future events precisely only because the scientist proceeds on the assumption that definite effects arise from specific causes. It is acceptable that there may be various subtle causes in the creation of a specific effect and we may be ignorant of some of them. For instance, ants can be seen transporting their eggs to secure places when rain is imminent, and sometimes they are seen doing so even when there is no visible cause like rain. Possibly, they do so because the anthill may not be safe there. The contention is that we may not be aware of some of the causes underlying a particular effect, but from this we cannot argue that there is no cause at all. When Swami Dayananda declares emphatically that "in the absence of a cause, the effect never arises,"[38] he means that the cause exists prior to the effect. The state of effect is only a transformation of the state of cause. The state in which a substance existed a moment ago was the cause, while the state in which it exists a moment later, is its effect. But those substances which exist, but have no cause are known as eternal. When a substance exists in its purest form and does not suffer any transformation, it does not possess the state of being an effect. For example, before the creation of the universe, prakrati (matter) existed as a cause without suffering any change in its original state. It is only when God gives impetus that the causal

state of prakrati changes and the process towards the emergence of effect, is initiated.

For Asatkaryavada of Vaisheshika and the Satkaryavada of Sankhya philosophies, please see page 64 of this book.

CHANGE

When we deliberate upon the fact of change, our study will remain incomplete without a consideration of the Buddhist concept of momentariness (shanikavada). When Mahatma Buddha referred to this world as momentary (sarvam shanikam), he implied that the world we inhabit is transitory. For Buddha this was a purely ethical question. In the Anguttara Nikaya, he declares "this world is momentary."[39]. This is a statement which is not peculiar to Buddhist literature but also common to the Upanishads and the Gita. Mahatma Buddha used to pronounce this entire world as ephemeral, changeable and full of sorrow.[40] He also advised that "see the world like a bubble of water, see it like a mirage, then death will never see you."[41] Here by calling the world transitory or momentary, Buddha did not imply any ontological principle, but it became the focal point of later Buddhist philosophers. Dr. Radhakrishnan refers Buddha as saying, "there is an unborn, an unoriginated, an uncompounded; were there not, O mendicant ! there would be no escape from the world of the born, the originated, the made and the compounded."[42] On the basis of above passage quoted by Dr. Radhakrishnan, Buddhist thought thus shows that Lord Buddha also believed in the existence of an eternal substance underlying the change. Thus, in calling the world transitory, all that Lord Buddha meant was that the world is subject to change.

Inspite of this, later Buddhist thinkers transformed this simple declaration into the focal point for serious debate and profound thought. Ratankirti argues that stable objects do not change, and hence all those states that can suffer change alone exist, and that there is no permanent entity. The basic concept of the theory of momentariness (*Shanikvada*) is that no object in this world is stable, everything is changeable. Whatever existed a moment ago does not exist now. For instance, the water that flows in the stream is every moment a fresh water at any one point, even then the flow appears to be a continuity. The concept "artha-kriya-karitva" means that every real substance gives rise

to its effects every moment, otherwise it wold forfeit its truth. Giving rise to effects implies change in the substance's own nature, and wherever there is change, there is transitoriness. In this way every substance, which can give rise to an effect, is transitory.

Swami Dayananda is not impressed by this Buddhist fascinating elaboration of the concept of momentariness (Shanikvada). Dayananda argues that "whatever is perceptually available cannot be supposed to be non-existent and neither can the ultimate subtle cause be said to be temporary."[43] What Swami Dayananda means is that the objects, that are perceptible presently, are merely the conglomeration of the extremely subtle atoms of prakrati or matter. Objects of the world are extremely changeable, because they are subjected to the conjunction and disjunction of atoms which occur continuously. Consequently, their external form is transitory, but their real nature which is called the 'pradhana' is composed of satva, rajas and tamas. This state of nature is even more subtle than atoms. It does not suffer any change in its essence. The objects, perceptible in the present, come into existence because of the varying combinations of these three constituents Swami Shankaracharya refutes the Buddhist contention on the ground that in the Buddhist view, there is no substratum of the world-illusion. In Buddhist view everything is ultimately a void. Shankara further argues that neither the world, nor change or even illusion can possibly exist without a substratum. Kant's concept of the 'thing-in-itself' also concedes a similar basis for all things, implying that there is something permanent underlying every object of change.[44] But we also cannot argue that this permanent substratum is subject to change. Instead, we should say that the parts or organs of this permanent substance suffer conjunction and disjunction and thus give rise to new objects. The substance itself is, by its very nature, unchangeable, because whatever is changeable cannot be permanent.

In Swami Dayananda's philosophy, this permanent substance, which is also the material cause of the universe, is not Shankara's Brahman in which the illusory world subsists. But it is prakrati or matter which is inert and which is possessed of three gunas. Kant describes it as unknowable, and hence he cannot say what it is. One major shortcoming of momentariness

(shanikvada) is that the principle cannot rationally establish the emergence of objects. In this concept everything survives only for one moment. Therefore , in that moment before giving rise to a new object, the orininal object suffers complete annihilation. How can this destroyed substance give rise to another object ? On the other hand, in the view of those, who accept the existence of one permanent, unchangeable substance as the material cause of the world, there is one difficulty; as to how the world of change can emerge from it ? Because we cannot postulate any change in it. If however, the change is accepted then it will destroy the character of it. After considering these difficulties, we have no hesitation in accepting Swami Dayananda's view that "this creation progresses from the subtle to the progressively gross states through various conjunctions, and consequently takes various forms. It is because of these combinations that it is designated a creation."[45] The various substances of the universe come into existence and suffer destruction through the conjunction and disjunction of the subtle parts of prakrati, but the substance itself is never destroyed.

Space and Time

"निष्क्रमणं प्रवेशनमित्याकाशस्य लिंगम्" ।

Vaisheshika Sutra 2–1–20

"Egress and Ingress is the sign (Linga) or attribute of space (Akash)."[46] Every object exists in some space. We cannot imagine any object that does not exist at some point or place. Swami Dayananda accepts the Vaisheshika concept of space and time without modification. Objects have their situation in the space. Every object in this universe is situated at one or the other place.[47] Even the objects that travel (like stars) are located in some one specific point at every moment. Similarly, every activity occurs at some point of time. Notions of here and there, above and below, etc., are all comprehended within the concept of space. Directions, too are comprehended in space, just as the directions, in which the sun rises is called east, while that in which it sets is west, and when we stand facing the rising sun, south is on our right side, while north lies to the left.[48] Length, breadth, and height are three dimensions of space, which are found in all physical objects.

There is motion in time. The past, present and the future are means of measuring time. The concepts of early and late are part of the concept of time.[49] Swami Dayananda states that time is used with reference only to temporary objects, permanent or eternal objects are beyond time [50] By this he means that eternal substances lack the features of creation and destruction, while temporary substances are both made and destroyed. Hence the act of creation also occurs within time, just as the act of destruction occurs within time.

This, however, does not apply to space. Prakrati or matter, which in Swami Dayananda's philosophy, is an eternal substance, continues to exist in space even when it exists in its original state. Consequently, he believes that space is permanent.[51]

Swami Dayananda's concept of space and time are in consonance with his realistic philosophy. Kant considers time and space as mental modes, which are the necessary conditions of perception and which we impose upon percieved objects. If this were accepted, it would be difficult to understand where a substance, which is real in-itself and exists separately from the mind, would be located. Not merely this, we find that even the spatial relations between objects are distinct from our mental concepts. Mental concepts cannot create relations of any kind between two objects. If time and space were mental, as Kant postulates, then it would have been possible for our mind to give any shape to objects and to locate them anywhere in space, according to our desire. But the fact that Europe lies to the north-west of India, is a spatial fact, which we cannot change, as long as prakrati itself does not change it. Here we find ample support in the views of Russell which are in agreement of this view.[52]

That directions in space are a creation of the human mind, is a contention acceptable to Swami Dayananda because direction arises from the relative positions of the earth and the sun. In space, there is no such thing as above or below, here or there, inside or outside. All such relations arise from the relative position of physical objects. The same fact also applies to time. Knowledge of the past, present and future, awareness of change, action and the knowledge that such changes will occur in things, are all relative to substances. In fact, in infinite time, there is no

past, present or future. Swami Dayananda declares that God's knowledge cannot be limited to these three dimensions of time because his knowledge is indivisible and uniform. Past and future are only for the jivas or souls,[53] because they relate their knowledge to the time.

But from this it can hardly be inferred that the practical concepts of space and time are our mental concepts, or time and space are dependent upon us, as Kant declares. In practice too, time and space are distinct from us, because the location of objects does not depend upon us. Change and location exist in objects. Hence, time and space do not depend upon the jiva for their existence. The time and space of experience are merely forms of eternal time and space. We assume their existence for practical convenience and for calculations relating to knowledge and science. Vigyan Bikshu also agrees with Swami Dayananda on this issue.[54]

COSMOLOGY

Like the Sankhyans, Swami Dayananda, too, arrives at the concept of prakrati by accepting the principle of causality and then seeking for the material cause of the universe. That the effect exists in unmanifested form in the cause, constitutes the Sankhya principle of satkaryavada, which is completely acceptable to Swami Dayananda. If the effect were not implicit in the cause, then any effect could arise from any cause. If such notion is accepted than what is the defect in Buddhist concept of nihilism, according to which something can arise from nothing. Contrary to this Swami Dayananda argues that the effect, which is like a sapling "which breaks open (upmardan) the seed, already existed in it and had it not been so, it would never have been born."[55] Every effect has a cause, while the cause itself is the effect of a preceding cause. However, this chain of cause and effect cannot go back into infinity and hence, we have to accept, as the first cause, the existence of an entity, which is the material cause of the entire universe. This material cause, according to Swami Dayananda, is "the abode and origin of the entire universe and this universe, then similar to the non-existent, lay concealed in prakrati, but it was not non-existent."[56]

In the beginning, as Sankhya philosophy postulates, prakrati existed in a state of equilibrium of its three elements satva, rajas and tamas. In that state, this universe was not in a condition to be known by anyone, even by logic or observed by the senses.[57] The reason is that the universe was concealed in its subtle cause, the original prakrati. At that time, the condition of prakrati was comparable to that of a deep fog, a state in which even the atoms had merged into their original state of rajas, satva and tamas. Only the subtle existence of satva, rajas and tamas pervaded everywhere. Then, there was no night or day, no birth or death, because since such celestial bodies as the sun did not exist, there was no question of the day or night occuring. Similarly since the corporeal mortals did not exist, death also did not exist. There was no one to die, hence there was no death. There was profound darkness everywhere.

In Swami Dayananda's philosophy, satva, rajas and tamas are not three attributes of prakrati, like Vaisheshika philosophy, but the very forms of nature, as the Sankhyans say.[58] In Vaisheshika philosophy qualities live in the substance in the relation of attributes and attributed. But according to Sankhya philosophy, satva, rajas and tamas are themselves prakrati.[59] In a state of equilibrium, the three constituent elements of prakrati remain stable. They are so composed that one element obstructs the action of the other.

In the beginning of creation (*kalpa*) God uses his powers and abilities to transform prakrati, the cause, into the universe, the effect. Dayananda states that "in the beginning all was enveloped in utter darkness. Nothing was discernable. It was like a dark night, the matter was so rarefied that it could be compared with ether. It was insignificant before God. Though it pervaded the gigantic space yet it was limited. God by His infinite power turned the causal matter into the universe which is an effect."[60] Here, Swami Dayananda means that inert prakrati cannot itself create the world. If it is suggested that 'pradhana' or prakrati possesses an inherent ability to create, Swami Dayananda argues that substances do not lose their nature. If creation is the natural power of prakrati then there will never be destruction. If on the contrary, destruction is its nature, then creation

will become impossible. If both these attributes are posted in one substance, then according to Dayananda, this destroys the system of both creation and destruction.[61]

In addition to this, Swami Dayananda adduces the argument that "without an agent, no action or any substance resulting from action can be created. Such objects for instance, the earth, which appear to possess a structure as a matter of chance can never be infinite. And, anything that is created by conjunction cannot exist prior to conjunction or subsequent to disjunction."[62] As a consequence of this argument, God becomes the creative agent or the efficient cause of creation. It has already been clarified on page 85 of this book that Swami Dayananda establishes in exactly the same way that Sankhya believes in God as the creator of the universe, because without it the Sankhya concept of pradhana would have been meaningless.

How the transformations take place in prakrati is described by Swami Dayananda in the following manner. God disturbs the equilibrium of prakrati by giving it the impetus. And prakrati then proceeds towards creation according to its definite laws. The first mutation of prakrati is universal intelligence (*mahatatva or budhi*), the second ego (*Ahamkara*), the third the five subtle elements (*tanmatras*), ten sense organs and the eleventh mind and subsequently the five gross elements (*mahabutas*).[63] Dayananda accepts this account of the evolution of creation from prakrati provided by Sankhya philosophy. The difference between other Sankhya commentators and Swami Dayananda is that Swami Dayananda interprets the Sankhya term 'purusha' both in the sense of God as well as jiva or soul. Like the Sankhya thinkers, he, too, divides the process of creation into four parts—(1) prakrati—in its stable state, prior to mutation, (2) prakrati-vikrati—the state of evolution in which Universal Intelligence, Ego, Five Subtle-Elements, evolve, (3) Vikrati—in this state of evolution Ten Senses, Mind and Five Gross Element evolve, (4) Neither prakrati nor Vikrat—the Purush.[64] The author of Sankhya-Karika has also adhered to the preceding divisions of the creative process.[65] What are mahatatva and the other evolutes of prakrati is a question which Swami Dayananda has not sought to elaborate. Nowhere has he provided a detailed account of them.

Hence, it appears that he completely agreed with Sankhya philosophy.

Mahatatva is the first evolute of prakrati in the process of creation, but it is a state in which the most subtle parts of matter, the atoms, had not yet been created. Swami Dayananda does not accept the view of Vigyan Bhikshu that the gunas existed in the form of subtle parts even in the state of equilibrium [66] As against this, Swami Dayananda asserts that atoms did not exist in the state of chaos, the gunas of prakrati then existed in their natural state. He asserts this, because be believes that atoms had not yet been created at all.[67] Atoms came into existence later in creatiou.[68] After the mahatatva, the ego (*Ahmkara*) came into existence. *Ahamkara* or ego is the principle of differentiation, and it was through this that the five subtle elements (*tanmatras*) came into existence. These were in atomic form. Because of the ego, differentiation occurred in the original matter and as a result, the five subtle elements came into existence in the from of subtle parts. As a result, atoms came into existence as the subtlest parts of the five subtle elements because of the ahamkara or ego in prakrati. According to Vaisheshika philosophy, atoms are the most subtle parts of matter. Thus, there is no contradiction between this view and Dayananda's view of atoms as effect. It can now be asked; since there is fundamental difference between the Sankhya conception of guna and the Vaisheshika concept of paramanu or atom, how can Swami Dayananda accept both of them as correct ? In fact, Swami Dayananda's originality lies in the fact that here he recognises only a difference in the order of creation and thus establish the coherence in the two philosophies, and thus he is able to harmonize the six systems of Indian philosophy.[69] Sankhya thinkers believe that atoms are the effect of prakrati.[70] But because they emerge at the state of five tanmatras, they are the state of prakrati-vikrati. Consequently, they can also be called the most subtle parts of matter. Apart from this, the Sankhya view of 'guna' is that they are triply divided powers of the atom. On diffusion, atom does not divide into parts but splits into its three power constituents. Because of this, too, the 'parmanu' can be considered the most subtle part of matter. As far as the subdivision of the paramanu is concerned, modern science also holds exactly the same view. According to it, the

atom is further divisible into three constituent parts—proton, neutron and electron. In this, the protons exist at the centre of the atom in a stable condition and carry a positive charge which balances the negative charge of the electrons. The electrons, the negatively charged particles, move in circles around the nucleus at very high speeds. Neutrons exist along with the protons at the centre or nucleus of the atom. They are devoid of any charge. The scientific concept of proton, electron and neutron is identical with the Sankhya conception of satva, rajas and tamas. Science believes that atoms arise from these three constituents.

Elaborating the concept of atom in perfect consistency with the Vaisheshika view, Swami Dayananda says, "the smallest particle which is not further divisible is called an atom, while the coujunction of sixty atoms is called 'anu'." (In the context of modern science, Dayananda's term 'paramanu' would be equivalent to 'atom', and 'anu' to molecule.) How the five gross elements (*sthulabhuta*) arise from the atoms, is explained thus by Swami Dayananda : "the combination of two molecules produces the gross air, of six produces fire, of eight produces water, and of ten composes the earth and other related tangible substances."[71] Yamunacharya is of the view that the smallest particles visible in the light of the sun are 'trasrenu', the smallest particles of matter. Yamunacharya's view is in consonance neither with ancient vedic texts nor modern science. Swami Dayananda declares that the conjunction of six molecules constitutes a 'trashenu', since these can form a visible or tangible part. Even this is open to doubt, since modern science offers the view that only the conjunction of many thousand molecules can constitute a tangible substance. In the Upanishades, the dimension of the atom has been stated to be the ten-thousandth part of the tip of a hair. Hence, the conjunction of four or six molecules cannot become visible.

Dayananda adduces Vedic and Upanishadic aphorisms in support of every view that he puts forward, and he constantly endeavours to mould his philosophy according to the true nature and bent of Vedic literature. Even in his description of creation, he adopts the same teohnique. He refers to numerous Vedic and Upanishadic mantras. We find the order of creation in Taitriyo-Upanishad which states that "From the Supreme Lord and

prakrati, there emerges *Akasha.* Akasha or space is unborn. Here it is said to have born, which means in the beginning the matter was laying scattered all over, therefore, there was no empty space. At the start, matter got collected, hence there appeared empty space. Air is born after the sky, fire after air, water after fire, earth after water, medicine after earth, foodgrains after medicine, semen from foodgrains, man from semen."[72] The sky is of two kinds, first, space in which the entire universe subsists, whose sign (linga) is ingress and regress, and second, that which is the medium of sound, the attribute of which is sound. Touch is the attribute of air, but it also contains heat and cold because of the co-occurence of fire and water. The attributes of fire are form and tactile sensations. Taste is the natural attribute of water, apart from which it also possesses coldness, while tactile sensation and form are its secondary attributes. Smell is the natural attribute of the earth, while touch, form and taste exist in it because of its association with water and fire.

Swami Dayananda provides a vary interesting account of the location and motion of celestial bodies in space, on the basis of Vedic mantras. He declares that our earth and the other celestial bodies of the sky have been created by God from the five gross elements (panch-bhuta). In the Vedas and other early texts, God has been referred to as '*Vishvakarma*' (the creator of the universe), because He is the being who creates and sustains the universe. Dayananda opines that the universe contains millions of suns like our sun which enlighten the celestial bodies of their respective solar systems or families.[73] Our earth was initially a part of the sun itself, it was only later that itgot separated. The earth, the sun and the other planets remain located in their spheres only because of motion and mutual attraction. In the Vedas, the word 'gou' (गौ) has been used to signify the earth. From this, Swami Dayananda inferes that the Vedas declare the celestial bodies to be in motion.[74] "Along with the earth, all the other planets of the solar system, along with their respective satellites, orbit round the sun. Their orbits are fixed. The moon is the earth's satellite."[75] The sun, too, is revolving. Swami Dayananda says that "the sun rotates very rapidly in a circular orbit, but it does not travel round any other planet."[76] Here some infer that the sun

revolves on its own axis, but that it does not revolve in a circular orbit. For a very long time, astronomy also accepted the view that stars remain stationary, and that the sun, also being a star remained stationary, while other celestial bodies revolved round the sun, as the earth does. But in the nineteenth century itself Swami Dayananda enlightend us on the basic of Vedic evidence that no celestial body in space can remain stationary withont moving or revolving. Consequently, even the sun moves.[77] But around whom star, nay, point the sun is revolving, Dayananda has not made it clear. Before Galeleo, it was assumed that the earth was the centre of this universe, while all other planetary bodies revolve around it and that even the sun revolved around it. Galeleo refuted this notion and placed the sun at the centre of the universe. But now, even the sun is no longer the centre of the universe, since the sun, along with its entire solar system, revolves around some other heavenly body or point in space.[78] At this point. Swami Dayananda differs from astronomy. However, his achievement lies in having provided this information about one centary ago. He was not a scholar of the English language, and consequently he did not possess knowledge of any modern scientific technique. This fact grants further strength to his conviction about the scientific knowledge concealed in the Vedas. **And it also appears tenable that if the Vedas are studied with a scientific mind and from a scientific point of view, even more facts pertaining to science and the universe can come to light.** The planetary members of the solar family revolve round the sun in their respective orbits due to the power of gravitation. The sun attracts the earth and other planetary bodies, while God, the Supreme Being, holds the entire universe in its place by His own power of attraction.

Swami Dayananda further adds that according to the Vedas, Paramatma has constructed seven circumferences (paridhi) around each of the planets, which means that there are seven layers covering the earth. Among them "the first is the *ocean*, the second, *air along with 'trarenu'*, third, the *air of the cloudy regions*, fourth, *rainy water in cloud forms*, (*vrashti-jala*), fifth, another-*layer of air above the forth*, sixth, *very subtle air which is referred to as 'dhananjaya'*, and the seventh, *extremely subtle air called sutratma vayu*, which is even more subtle than Dhananjaya."[79]

Though Swami Dayananda has not clarified what he intended to establish by mentioning these seven layers. The modern science reveals to us the scientific mysteries implicit in these layers. Scientific research has discovered that there are three protective layers around the earth. The sky containing air reaching ten miles above the earth is called the *toposphere*, the next twenty miles that *stratosphere* and the highest part of the sky is called the *ionosphere*. The lowest part, the toposphere consists of oxygen, nitrogen and other gases. In the region above it, the stratosphere the molecules of the gases disintegrate into atoms. For example, the molecule of oxygen consists of two atoms. It gets disintegrated into two atoms. At the next higher level even the atoms disintegrate into particles of negative and positive charge. The reason behind this process of progressive disintegration is, that due to the constant explosions taking place in the sun, the atoms of hydrogen are thrown out into the solar system for millions of miles. Scientists are of the view that these atoms reach the earth's ionosphere where they collide with the atoms of oxygen and, as a result, the atoms of the ionosphere disintegrate. It is because of the ionosphere that the earth is protected from the disastrous impact of the constant solar explosions. What was the purpose of God in creating the seven layers around the earth ? This Dayananda could not elaborate perhaps due to lack of space. But it is apparent that at least one purpose of the seven layers must have been to protect the earth from the destructive influence of forces operating in space. In fact, there is undoubtedly some scientific mystery implicit in the Vedic description of the seven layers. This is clarified by the fact that each one is progressively more subtle than the preceding layer. The layer called '*dhananjaya*' by Swami Dayananda is the equivalent of the stratosphere, while the seventh, the most subtle layer called '*sutratma*' parallels the ionoshere, while the second to fifth layers appear to be distinctions of the toposphere itself.

Swami Dayananda is of the view that this entire universe, in which there are millions of planets like the sun, is astonishingly vast. But in comparison to God himself, it is an insignificant particle, existing in only one region of God.[80] God is infinite while the universe is finite. Parmatma assumes the universe

within Himself and, therefore, it exists in one part or region of God. Einstein, the greatest scientist of the present century, also arrived at the conclusion that though this universe is constantly progressing towards growth, yet it is not infinite.[81] God pervades the entire universe and assumes every entity within Himself. That is why the Yajurveda refers to God as pervading all living and non-living beings '*vibhu prajaasu*'. (Yajurveda 32·8)

Does the life exists on other planets also as it exists on the earth ? Swami Dayananda's answer to this query, is that life does possibly exist on other planets, but there may be a difference in their bodies. He argues that on the earth itself, one finds differences in the forms of bodies of different regions because of climatic differences. In view of this, why should one be surprised if living beings on other planets have differently shaped bodies ? He then goes on to say that God must have spread the light of the Vedas on other planets also, just as He has enlightened the human race on this earth.[82]

In the beginning of creation (kalpa), God created the universe in the same way in which He had done it before. The creation and destruction of the universe follow each other as day follows night. It is in view of this that Dayananda opines that the process of creation and destruction is infinite in terms of order.[83] Since the cause of the universe, prakrati, is eternal, therefore, the process of creation and destruction must also be infinite. This is an argument we can accept without demur.

Swami Dayananda's description of the process of creation is scientific in itself and in its main points it comes fairly close to the discoveries of modern science. In the middle of the nineteenth century, when Swami Dayananda had composed his texts, science was ignorant at least of those facts concerning the universe which were later provided to it by Einstein. But Swamiji was aware of them even then. Swami Dayananda is fully convinced that the mantras of the Vedas are filled with knowledge and science and in his own texts, he makes his study of the universe on the basis of these mantras. His originality lies in his having revealed the mysteries concealed in Vedic mantras concerning nature and propagated them fearlessly. While some of his claims have now been validated by science, some of them still appear to be exag-

gerations. However, it is now generally accepted that a creation similar to our own may possibly exist on other celestial bodies though the living beings may have bodies shaped differently from the human body. It cannot be accepted at present that God must have enlightened them with the knowledge of the Vedas on these other creations also. However, when some man has the good fortune to set his foot on some other planets and he finds it to be true, this view will then be accepted without hesitation and in consequence, all of Swami Dayananda's claims about the Vedas will be accepted unconditionally. At the same time, even today, we cannot dismiss Swami Dayananda's claims as mere flights of fancy, because many of his claims regarding the Vedas has now been validated.

7

EPISTEMOLOGY

Background—In Indian philosophy, such questions as what constitutes knowledge ? What are the means to obtaining knowledge ? What is the difference between true and false knowledge, between the knower and the known ?—have been considered at great length. In the Upanishads one finds ample references about the knower, the known and the knowledge, wherever these are found necessary. But these texts do not contain an epistemological elaboration of knowledge and its means. A subtle and sophisticated analysis of these subjects was conducted later in the six systems of Indian philosophy, more particularly in Nyaya philosophy, though it was carried to its highest degree of sophistication in the commentaries composed on the texts pertaining to these systems of thought. Epistemology is an important branch of philosophy. Plato and Aristotle gave considerable thought to it in their metaphysical speculations. But for the Sophists it was the only means to arrive at the truth, it was a conviction which led to their entanglement in the maze of skepticism. But, both Plato and Aristotle make successful use of epistemology as an important contributor to philosophical thought. Before launching on the analysis of epistemology, Nyaya philosophy declares that it uses this branch to obtain correct, true and reliable knowledge through which moksha or salvation, which means the complete absence of suffering, can be obtained. According to the Nyaya-Sutra, this branch of philosophy makes the man's art of obtaining knowledge scientific. The questions that it concentrates on are what are the obstacles to knowledge ? How can correct thinking or speculation be achieved so that the right results can be arrived at ? It seeks objective answers to these and related questions.

Some philosophers proceed from fixed assumptions or prejudices regarding epistemology and it is contrary to their principles to emerge from the dimensions they so rigidly set themselves. If such philosophers start from false assumptions, they are likely to wander aimlessly in the dark, narrow and blind lanes of invalid thoughts. If they are in favour of correcting their error, they are then forced to abandon their hypotheses. Irrespective of the point from which we start in our search for truth, if we are determined to arrive at the truth and are broad-minded enough to reject every conept that proves untrue, we can progress towards the truth. This very simple principle is the basis of Swami Dayananda's epistemology. For him, epistemological analysis is of especial significance, because only through such an analysis can he expect to attain the highest level of truth. For Dayananda, logic is an instrument in the search for truth. He does not favour logical argumentation for its own sake.

The question of how we obtain knowledge is one that has been the cause of considerable controversy among philosophers. An even more controversial issue has been that of the validity of knowledge. Materialist philosophers do not believe in any permanent knower, since they believe that knowledge is obtainable only through sense perception. For them, the world is real and the soul is only an evolute of matter. On the other hand, Vijyanvadi Bauddha thinkers consider external knowledge merely an expression of inner vijyana or consciousness. In their view nothing exists external to the knower. They also assume, very interestingly, that even the knower himself is no more than a congregation of five skandhas or five types of impressions. In consequence, they become solipsist like Hume. How the knowledge will be possible without a knower, is a major problem in the philosophy of materialism. Secondly if perception is the only valid source of knowledge them the knowledge so acquired should constitute true knowledge. In such a case, there would be no possibility of doubt or misconception. In the same way, if we agree with the Buddhists that knowledge is merely an expression of inner vijyan or consciousness, then the cognition of a snake in the rope should not be taken as an illusion. This system, too, leaves no scope for explaining the phenomena of false perception.

It is necessary to consider all such questions concerning knowledge in any epistemological analysis.

Dayananda's Epistemology

Swami Dayananda is a realist in his philosophical inclination and hence his epistemology is also markedly realistic. His epistemological approach will be analysed here according to the following outline –

(1) Knowledge is impossible without a knower, hence there is some knower.

(2) The known exists independently of the knower, otherwise what is known ?

(3) Sense organs are means of knowledge in the relationship between the knower and the known.

(4) Analysis of the sources of knowledge.

(5) Whether everything we know is true knowledge and if not, what is false knowledge ?

(6) What is the nature of true knowledge ?

Existence of the Knower—Descartes' famous statement "I think, therefore I exist", points to the first problem in our way, the problem of establishing whether there is a knower. Keeping in mind Descrates' statement, it can be argued that if I do not exist, then the process of thinking cannot occur. Consequently, there can be no feeling, desire, pain, pleasure or knowledge of the world, etc. Therefore, from this it appears correct to maintain that knowledge is impossible without a knower. Whether we cognise any thing or not, the ego, which is knower, does exist in either condition. In his argument against the materialism of the Charvaka philosophers, Swami Dayananda argues that "when the soul is separated from the body, the body no longer possesses any knowledge...that entity, by the conjunction of which consciousness occurs and that by whose disjunction inertness results, is separate from the body. Just as the eyes observe everything except themselves, in the same way the perceiver cannot possess sensuous perception of himself. Just as the perceiver observes things through the eyes, but knows the eyes through his power of knowledge. That which is the observer is never perceived. Just

as there cannot be anything based without a base, an effect without a cause, parts without a whole and action without an agent, in the same manner, how can there be knowledge without a knower ?"[1] Here, Swamiji points to another important fact by declaring that the knower always remains the knower. Just as the eye observes everything without observing itself, in the same way, the soul, which is the knower cannot be knowable. But it gains knowledge of all other objects through its inherent power of knowledge. Hume wanted to know the soul as an object of perception, but whenever he focussed his attention on the soul, all that he could observe was the constant and uninterrupted flow of thoughts, which are but the impressions in the mind. It is because of this that Kant considers the soul unknowable. In his opinion, the soul is the "Transcendental Unity of Apperception," something unknowable. Descartes' thesis "I think, therefore, I exist," can establish the existence of the knower only when the thought process occurs. In deep sleep, the process of thought is suspended. Does this imply that the knower then ceases to exist ? This is not acceptable; when we get up from deep sleep, we proclaim that we slept well. The person who experienced a happy sleep obviously existed during sleep as well. Thinking is not the only attribute of the perceiver and neither is it the sole characteristic of his existence. Consequently, we should reverse Descartes' statement and declare that "I exist, therefore, I think." The existence of the knower is self-evident and an essential element in the generation of knowledge. It cannot be known as the object of perception, as Hume had wrongly presumed. Swami Dayananda criticises the Buddhist viewpoint of nihilism or the absence of soul by arguing that knowledge cannot exist without a knower. He says, "Non-existence cannot perceive non-existence and hence this proves that the knower and the known are two distinct entities."[2]

Existence of the Known—The realists completely reject the hypothesis of the idealists that the object which is known has no existence separate from and in the absence of the knower. Against this, the realists argue that the knower as well as the known object both have their own existence, without which it is

difficult to say what the knowledge is of. The idealist's answer is that physical objects or the form, in which they are perceived, are only sensations because we can never directly perceive the substance itself. All that we receive are certain sensations on the basis of which we presume that we have perceived the substance. They further argue, since these sensations cannot exist independently of the mind or conscience and hence all worldly objects exist in the conscience or soul. The Vijyanvadi Buddhist states that the external objects are nothing but the expression of internal vijyan or consciousness. Infact, there is no substance distinct from vijyan, and just as the soul creates its own substances during the state of dreaming, though all of them are actually illusory, in the same manner, the substances of the world are also illusory. Swami Shankaracharya criticises this buddhist statement that internal vijyan appears like the object outside by saying that it is like to say that Vishnu Dutt appears to be the son of a barren woman.[3] He means to say that thoughts are abstract and hence they cannot create substances, just as a barren woman cannot give birth to a son. Swami Dayananda's criticism of the buddhist position is that "if vijyanvadi assumes that everything external is a void or non-existent, then mountains should exist within him and if we say that the mountain is in fact within him, then does his heart possess the space required for a mountain ?" Hence, he concludes, the mountain exists outside and "knowledge of the mountain exists within the soul."[4]

The major drawback in the idealist argument is that they presume that objects are known through sensations and then jump to the conclusion that objects themselves are only sensations. This is a wrong conclusion on the right premise. It is all right that things are known through the sensations but, this does not mean that sensations are objects themselves. For instance, a man named Vishnudatta is known throughout the world for his wealth, but this does not mean that he himself becomes wealth. The truth of the matter is that the sensations, which give rise to knowledge of objects, establish that they arise from certain objects and if the object does not exist, the sensations would also not exist. The existence of the world is, in no way, dependent upon us, or our perception of it. Despite the most strenuous

efforts on our part, there can be no substance in the world which is constructed merely out of the material of our thoughts. If the vijyanvadi argues that objects can be created as dreams are created, Swami Dayananda's argument is that "a dream never occurs of a thing which was not previously perceived, seen or heard. The substances that exist in the real or waking world are perceived by the perceiver and the impressions thus created subsist in his soul. In his dreams, he perceives only these substances."[5] From this, it is inferred that the existence of dreams, too, is based on the real world. If the waking world did not exist, dreams, too, would not exist. On the other hand, if it is argued from this that both the waking world and the dreams exist in the mind, since the mind perceives objects as existing in the world while awake, but as existing within himself when asleep, Swami Dayananda refutes the contention by arguing that "if dreams could occur without impressions then even the person born blind should have dreams consisting of vision and form." He thereby implies that in the absence of the known, knowledge is derived from previous impressions. The person who is born blind is unable to perceive the objects of the world even when awake and hence even in his dreams he cannot have the vision of objects. This establishes the fact that dreams themselves are dependent upon the impressions obtained during wakefulness. If the waking world is also assumed to be the outcome of impressions, it would be impossible to explain when and from where these impressions originated. This goes to prove that the world perceived when awake does not subsist in the mind, but is distinct from the perceiver mind.

The Brahamvadins, who argue that the world is an illusion arising out of maya while the Brahman alone is true, or that the world is an illusion similar to the illusion of a snake in the rope, and since there is no distortion of Brahman, the jiva by ignorance falsely perceives the external world in Brahman, also belong to the class of idealist thinkers. They argue that all the substances of the world are false imaginatian because they are the creation of ignorance. And the distinction between the knower and the known is also false.[6] For them, it is the jiva who indulges in such false imaginings, who falsely perceives or posits the world in

Brahman. Shankaracharya, in his commentary on Gaudpada's Karika on the Mandukyopanishad, argues that the objects of the world are false because they are perceptible.[7] With the help of a syllogism, Shankaracharya explains his concept in the manner that (1) The objects of the waking are illusory; this is the *proposition* (प्रतिज्ञा), (2) being perceptible; this is the *reason* (हेतु), (3) like the objects perceived in dreams; this is the *example* (उदाहरण), (4) as the objects, perceived in the dream, are false, in the same way their perceptiblity is found in the waking; this is the *application* (उपनय), (5) therefore, the objects of waking are also illusory; this is *conclusion* (निगमन). What Shankaracharya implies in the preceding argument is that just as the objects of dreams are sublated in the waking world, in the same way the objects of waking are sublated in 'turiya' or the state of true knowledge. Therefore, the world of waking is a big illusion.[8] But Swami Dayananda has already argued that prior impressions are essential for both dreams and false perceptions. Hence, it is justifiable to ask : in the case of world-illusion where from the prior impressions have originated ? The perceiver of illusion (a snake in the rope) is overpowered by the ignorance. But, if this is used as an analogy, does this imply that the observer of this illusory world, who is Brahman himself, is also overpowered by maya or ignorance ? Dayananda rejects any such contention, because he says that Brahman is of the nature of perfect and pure knowledge. In addition, Swami Dayananda further argues that imagination is an attribute, which cannot subsist apart from the being of which it is an attribute. And, when this being is the jiva, who is also the eternal Brahman himself, his imagination must also be accepted as true, otherwise the possessor of the imagination must also be false.[9] From this, it is easy to conclude that the world of perception i.e. the waking world, is a reality.

Role of Senses in obtaining of knowledge – The consciousness of substances that arises through contact between the knower and the known, is called knowledge. According to Swami Dayananda, the soul acquires the knowledge of the external world through the medium of senses and the mind. Mind is the medium between the soul and the sense organs. Mind, being evolved from satva, possesses the power of knowing every

sensation and through them the object, of which they are the sensations. Swami Dayananda has not cast much light upon the process of knowledge, but his views on the subject are very clear. He holds that—(1) all objects first come into contact with the sense organs which give rise to impressions of the object, (2) these impressions of the attributes of the object pass into the mind, (3) the soul, in conjunction with the mind, uses these impressions as a base to perceive the object of which they are the attributes. The question that can be raised here is : since our perception is confined to the attributes of objects and not extend to the object itself, why should we accept the existence of the object on the basis of this assumption ? Swami Dayananda's reply is that attributes can not exist independently of an object or substance.[10] Attributes depend upon a substance for their existence. This is a very small mistake in the idealist argument that they refute to infer the existence of the substance from the perception of its attributes, instead, they obstinately accept the sensations of the attributes as the object. On the contrary, the truth is that impressions arise only when attributes of the object come into contact with the sense organs.

Five Tests of Knowledge—Whatever we know through the senses or by other means, is not all true. To ascertain that whatever knowledge we have received is true or not or how much truth is there in it, Swami Dayananda gives us *five kinds of tests*—(1) Whatever is in consonance with the attributes, actions and nature of God and the Vedas...... (2) Whatever is in accordance with the order and progress of creation...... (3) (*Apta*) all that which agrees with the preachings of virtuous, learned, truthful and veracious persons, .. (4) that which is in consonance with the voice of one's inner soul which is pure and one's knowledge, and (5) that which can be testified by the eight valid sources of knowledge (*Asta-pramanas*) i.e. perception (*pratyaksha*), inference (*anumana*), comparison (*upmana*), verbal knowledge (*sabda*), tradition (*Aitihya*), presumption (*arthapatti*), subsumption (*sambhava*) and non-existence (*abhava*), should be taken to be true "[11]

Eight Pramana or Sources of Knowledge

The foregoing excerpt shows that in Swami Dayananda's opinion, in addition to other means of knowledge, eight sources

of knowledge or pramana are very important in the cognitive process. The eight pramana are the following—

(1) Perception (*pratyaksha*), (2) Inference (*anumana*), (3) Comparison (*upmana*), (4) Verbal knowledge (*sabda*), (5) Tradition (*Aitihya*), (6) Presumption (*arthapatti*), (7) Subsumption (*sambhava*) and (8) Non-Existence (*abhava*). The first four, i. e., perception, inference, comparison and verbal knowledge, are in accord with the four pramana pointed out in the Nyaya Sutra of Gautama, while the latter four, tradition, presumption, subsumption and non-existence are taken from Vatsyayana's commentary on Nyaya philosophy.

Perception or pratyaksha—In his elucidation of Gautama's Sutra on perception, Swami Dayananda points out, "the knowledge that arises from the direct and uninterrupted contact between the sense organs—ears, skin, eyes, tongue and nose—with sound, tactile sensation, vision, taste and smell and the subsequent contact between the sense organs and the mind, and the mind with the soul is called perception. But, that should not originate in relation to word and its object, but the object of perception must directly come in contact of senses, otherwise it will become a verbal knowledge. Again it must be unerring (*avyabhichari*). By avyabhichari means that cognition, thus arised by perception, should not be sublated by anv subsequent cognition. For instance, a person observes a pole in the night and take it as a man, but when again observes it in the day his previous knowledge of it as a man is sublated and it remains as a pole. Therefore, perceptual knowledge must be free from errors. Next condition of perception is 'vyavasayatamaka' which is illustrated thus : a person, observing the sand on the banks of a river may exclaim : are the clothes drying there or there is either some water or something else; the person standing there is either Devadatta or Yagyadatta. As long as these facts are not determined, they do not constitute perception. "Only that can be called perception which is unheard, unerring and determined."[12]

In the preceding analysis of perception, Swami Dayananda holds that the soul is the actual knower of perception which he perceives with the help of the conjunction of mind with the sense organs and the mind with the soul. The contact of the sense

organs and the object cannot, of itself, provide knowledge of the object. The conjunction between the mind and the sense organs is essential. The reason lies in the fact that in deep sleep, (*sushupti*), the contact between the mind and the sense organs is destroyed, consequently, nothing is perceived. Even while awake, the eyes may fail to perceive objects before it if the mind is focussed on some other subjects. This establishes that for perception contact between the mind and the senses is essential. Besides, the mind must also be in conjunction with the soul, because without such contact, the mind is inert and being so, it cannot be the recepient of knowledge. In fact, the soul becomes the knower only when it is in contact with the mind which, in turn, is conjoined to the sense organs.

The ot er three requisites are that knowledge must be unheard, unerring and determined. Their meanings have already been clarified through the preceding illustrations.

Indeterminate and Determinate Perception – When the sense organs come into contact with the object, various sensations about its varied attributes are generated. For example, the perception of water includes the sensations of coldness (felt by touch), taste (felt by the tongue), form (seen by the eyes), liquidity etc. In their separateness, these sensations are indicative merely of sound, form, taste, tactuality and smell. In their discrete condition, they do not constitute perception of the object. In such a state of discreteness, they are referred to as indeterminate (*nirvikalpika*) perception. These discrete impressions are collated and organised when they reach the mind and it is then that the brain determines the object to which they relate and recognises its nature. Knowledge of this latter kind is called determinate (*savikalpaka*) perception. Swami Dayananda himself did not indulge in such a subtle analysis of the perception. But the distinction between indeterminate and determinate perception is indicated in his statement that "now we should consider that the senses and the mind provide knowledge of attributes, not of their bearer. For instance, the four sense organs provide knowledge of the sensations of tactuality, form, taste and smell but the bearer of these attributes, which is the earth, is perceived by the mind conjoined with the soul."[13]

Inference or *anuman*—Inference is the second pramana. Inference depends upon perception. Swami Dayananda defines inference thus : "when knowledge of an unperceivable object or its part is obtained through the perception of some concomitance which we have perceived elsewhere in some different place and time, such knowledge is called inference. For example, one obtains knowledge of the father on perceiving the son, of fire on perceiving smoke on the mountain, of a previous birth on perceiving suffering and pleasure in the present world."[14]

Like Vatsyayana, Swami Dayananda also holds that inference is impossible without perception. Inference literally means the measuring after something. He says "अनु अर्थात् प्रत्यक्षस्य पश्चान्मीयते जायते येन तदनुमानम्", which means inference is the term which refers to knowledge arising after perception. For example, one cannot know of some invisible fire without perceiving the smoke rising from it. By perceiving the one part of an object we can cognize the rest of the object by inference on the basis of invariable concomitance. For instance, the presence of fire is inferred from the perceived presence of smoke, because fire and smoke are related to each other through invariable concomitance. Inferential knowledge thus leads from the knowledge of the perceived to that of the unperceived, for instance, the presence of pain, pleasure, consciousness and other characteristics leads to the inference that the soul exists.

'Vyapti' implies a universal relation between the object (ling) and the sign (linghi) and without this, inference is impossible. Swami Dayananda analyses 'vyapti' on the basis of Sankhya text in the following way : "if both object and sign, in other words, that which is to be proved and that which enables such proof to be made, possess an invariable concomitance, such a relationship is called 'vyapti', as for example, the association of fire and smoke."[15]

Inference is of three kinds—

'*Purvavatta*'—"Here the perception of cause leads to knowledge of effect; for example, when clouds (the cause) are observed and rain (the effect) is inferred."[16]

'*Sheshavatta*' "Which means that the perception of the effect leads to the inference of the cause, for example, an increase in the flow of the river leads to the inference of heavy rain upstream."[17]

"*Sam ınyatodrasta* – When there exists some similarity between two things which co-exist yet one is not the cause of other, is samanyatodrasta. For example, a person cannot go from one place to another without walking. In the same way, others also cannot transfer to a different place without walking."[18] Nyaya philosophers infer the existence of the soul on the basis of this kind of inference by observing pain, pleasure, desire, attachment, etc., in the body.

Comparison or "*Upamana* - the term refers to that form of knowledge in which the knowledge of a thing is gained through its similarity to another thing pereviously will known. "उपमीयते येनतदुपमानम्". For example, one may say that the wild cow (*gavaya*) in the forest is like a cow which can be seen in the house. Whichever anima! in the forest appears to be like the cow, is known to be the wild cow called '*gavaya*'[19] What Swami Dayananda means is that one may have heard of a '*gavaya*' and of its being like a cow, without ever having seen one. If, then, one does see animal resembling the cow in the forest, one immediately infers that it is a '*gavaya*'.

Most logicians subject the comparison to criticism on following various grounds. They argue that knowing an object on the basis of comparison only is not free from difficulties, because if there is perfect similarity between the means (साधन) and the end (साध्य) then it amounts to saying that Mr. A is like Mr. A. Such a statement obviously provides no fresh knowledge. If the two analogous objects are similar in the main, but different in one or two respects, even then it is not necessary that the means will necessarily lead to the knowledge of objeet to be known (साध्य). For instance, take the case of black cow, it resembles buffalo due to its similarities. But by having similarities it cannot be buffalo. And suppose the dis-similarities are in excess than there cannot be any knowledge through comparison. The Vaisheshika philosophers consider comparison as a part of inference arguing that "this is a gavaya or wild cow, because

it is similar to cow and anything which is similar to a cow is a gavaya." Sankhya comprehends comparison under verbal knowledge or *sabda.* But in my opinion, comparison is neither purely inferential, nor verbal knowledge (*sabda*), nor even a combination of both. This kind of argument has four constituents— (1) someone has said that the gavaya is like a cow, (2) one observes a gavaya in the forest, (3) there is memory of the previously heard statement that the gavaya is like a cow, (4) hence, the animal that is perceived, being similar to a cow, is a gavaya. The final statement, which is also the conclusion, is indicative only of similarity, not of any causal relationship. Because of this, it is not inference. Besides, the mere verbai statement by someone that the gavaya is like a cow is not sufficient to apprehend the knowledge of gavaya. Neither can the direct perception of an animal establishes it as a gavaya, since there is no perception of the analogy between the gavaya and the cow. Thus, it is not possible to conclude that the perceived animal is, in fact, a gavaya. Consequently, comparison is neither perception nor inference, nor verbal knowledge, or a combination of both. The true acceptability of comparison lies in psychological analogy, which has been referred to, by the author of Nyaya, as known similarity (प्रसिद्ध साधर्म्य), while Swami Dayananda refers to it as perceived similarity (प्रत्यक्ष साधर्म्य), by which he means similarity which leads one to believe that the perceived animal is definitely a gavaya.

Verbal Knowledge or *Sabda*—"An '*Apta*' is a person who is perfect in knowledge, virtuous, philanthrophist, truthful, active, free from passions, who having acquired both material as well as spiritual knowledge i.e. from earth to God, is always inclined to teach the mankind for its good. The teachings or words of such a seer and the Vedas, which are the emanation of perfect God should be considered as verbal knowledge or Sabda."[20]

In the acquisition of knowledge, authoritative statements or words of learned persons as evidence have a special significance for the human race. If we had not relied upon the knowledge of our forefathers and if every generation had begun anew the task of discovering knowledge in every sphere for itself, the human race would not have scaled the heights of progress,

as it has done today. However, practical experience also shows that every item of knowledge, handed down by our forefathers, is not correct. Newton made improvements in the mathematical laws which Copernicus had discovered. His work was later on improved upon by Einstein. Despite this, we must accept the conclusions and theories of scholars as long as these do not stand disproved. Swami Dayananda's view is that the individuals whose statements are accepted as authority must possess two attributes. First, they should be seers who have realized truth and secondly, they should be philanthropists whose intellects are not blotted with even the least tinge of selfishness. Only such persons can be considered perfect (apta). A selfless person has no reason to indulge in falsehood. Inspite of this, if their statements contradict the Vedas, then it is the latter which must be granted supremacy and it should be understood that their (apta's) knowledge is not perfect. But the main hurdle in accepting the Vedas as evidential, is, that Vedic mantras are excessively profound and mysterious, with the result that different scholars interpret them differently. In view of this, which interpretation is to be accepted as the truest ? A Vedic mantra, which has not been elaborated, is something of a puzzle in-itself. It can then be suggested that the elaboration which appears rational and in consonance with the process of creation should be accepted. But, another major obstacle is that knowledge of substances is unstable, since it is constantly changing. In the scientific field, assumptions are changing with bewildering rapidity. If one scientific principle is used as the basis for an elaboration today, what is to be done if that principle itself stands refuted tomorrow ? What is meant by the preceding argument is that before accepting the Vedas as perfectly authoritative, it is necessary to have a profoundly researched elaboration of the Vedas, so that they can be accepted as authoritative without the least tinge of doubt.

Tradition or *Aitihya*—This name is given to the life sketch of a person which serves as a means of knowledge.

Implication or *Arthapatti*—This is getting at a new fact or presuming of something on the basis of another fact. For example, "one person said to another that the existence of clouds

leads to rain and the existence of a cause leads to its effect Thus, even without being stated, this statement proves that there can be no rain without clouds and no effect without a cause."[21]

Subsumption or *Sambhava*—That which is opposed to the process of creation can never occur, for instance, the children cannot be born in the absence of parents. Its corollary, that only that is possible which agrees with the process of creation, for instance, the birth of a son through the sexual congress of mother and father.[22]

Negation or *Abhava*— "न भवन्ति यस्मिन् सोऽभाव" which means that, that which does not exist is non-existent, just as one said to another to bring an elephant and the latter, observing an absence of elephant there, fetched one from the place where elephant existed.[23]

These last four means of knowledge are not of much significance. It is quite easy to comprehend them among the first four. Swamiji himself says that, "if aitihya is comprehended under verbal knowledge and sambhava, arthapatti and abhava are comprehended under anumana or inference, then only four kinds of means of knowledge are left." Nyaya logicians also merge these last four under the preceding four.

Existence of Sensuous Knowledge

The sense organs are like doors for the reception of worldly knowledge. All the knowledge of the world first enters through these doors, reaches the internal organ and from there it is transmitted to the soul. Memorisation, thinking and meditation are mental processes that come at a later stage. Their basis is the perception through the five senses. Swami Dayananda holds that the world is true and that the sense organs are the means of obtaining the knowledge of the world for soul. The five sense organs—ears, eyes, nose, tongue and skin—are capable of providing knowledge of sound, vision or form, smell, taste and tactile sensations.[24] Nyaya Shastra has accepted the existence of five subtle elements—sound, form, smell, taste and touch—and their five related gross elements because there are five senses.[25] In other words, the presence of the five sense organs suggests the presence of five related subtle elements, because man, who is

God's highest creation, is possessed of five sense organs. The world has been created specifically for his enjoyment and salvation, and hence there should also be five subjects of knowledge. If this were not so, how would man obtain of any additional subjects of knowledge ?

Swami Shankaracharya believes that the knowledge produced by the sense organs is false, because the senses invariably take the soul towards untruth and illusion. In his "Chatursutri", a mini-commentary on the Brahma-Sutra, he says that perception and the various means of knowledge or pramanas including the texts are bound by ignorance [26] Clearly, then, for him all sensuous know'edge is false, riddled with ignorance. Of course, this assumption agrees perfectly with his view that the entire universe is one massive illusion. Though Ramanuja believes in a qualified monism, Vishishtadvaita, he accepts the world as real and unlike Shankara, does not dismiss all sensuous knowledge as necessarily false. His view is, that if Shankara dismisses sensuous knowledge as false because it contradicts the statements in the Shruti, then according to his own thesis, Shruti itself is not acceptable, because it exists at the practical level only.[27] In other words, Ramanuja completely refutes Shankara's standpoint.

The question that we must consider is, that if we accept the senses as the means to knowledge, whether this assumption is likely to take us in the same direction as that accepted by such idealists as Locke, Berkeley and Hume. After all, Berkeley and Hume took this assumption of Locke to its logical conclusion. We must make it clear at this point that Swami Dayananda accepts not only the impressions generated by the senses, but two other principles as central to the cognitive process. The first of these is the soul's power of knowledge. Dayananda believes that the soul possesses the power to distinguish between truth and falsehood. The second is his conviction that the impressions of the previous birth constitute the mental structure, interests, behaviour and stream of impressions of the living being in its present life Locke assumes that the mind is a clean slate at the time of birth (*tabula rasa*). On it, is imprinted the knowledge obtained in this life. If Locke's principle, that every impression

obtained by the senses is imprinted on the mind, were accepted, he would be unable to explain how these impressions become transformed into knowledge and how false knowledge occurs. But it is clear in Dayananda's philosophy that the soul has discriminating power because it is essentially of the nature of knowledge, that it distinguishes between the true and the false, but that it inclines towards false ambitions only because of the impressions imprinted on it by previous experiences.

It is now quite clear that in Dayananda's philosophy, the senses are treated as instruments which generate knowledge about the external world. However, all the knowledge that they obtain is restricted only to an awareness of the attributes of substances, and these impressions are analysed by the soul working in conjunction with the mind.

False Knowledge

All the knowledge that we obtain through our senses is not true. And, in addition to sensuous knowledge, there are many other mental apprehensions, such as dreams, illusions, hallucination, etc., which are false. Later on, these cognitions are sublated on getting the true knowledge. This establishes the falsity of our previous knowledge. Any cognition is true or correct only as long as it is not falsified. There is false perception of a snake in a piece of rope.[28] However, as soon as one obtains true knowledge of the rope, the illusion of the snake is destroyed; the illusion of false knowledge exists only as long as we are not aware of the rope as a rope. Swami Dayananda opines that this illusion is due to ignorance, which arises because of defects or faults in senses and mental impressions (sanskaras).[29] Further elaborating the notion of true knowledge and ignorance, Swami Dayananda points out that "that which creates awareness of the real nature of substances is true knwledge, while that which does not provide real knowledge of the substance or that which produces the knowledge of some other thing in some thing, is called ignorance."[30] In his definition of ignorance, the Yoga philosopher Maharishi Patanjali, too, has pointed out that ignorance consists in understanding the temporal as the eternal, impure as pure pain as pleasure, unconsciousness as consciousness. Maharishi

Patanjali implies much the same concept as Swami Dayananda, though he has expressed it in relatively more philosophical terms.

The problem of what ignorance really is, cannot be finally solved by pointing out that it is false knowledge or the cause of false knowledge or that it originates due to the defects in senses or mental impressions. All that such definitions of false knowledge indicate is that its cause is ignorance. If then ignorance is defined as false knowledge, such an argument amounts to dependent reasoning. Vyas declares in his commentary on the Yoga that "knowledge which is contrary to true knowledge, is ignorance."[31] The Vaisheshika refers to it as defective knowledge (*Dushta jyana*).[32] Sankhya calls it non-discrimination and therefore considers it the cause of bondage (*bandha*).[33] But how does ignorance arise and what is its nature ? Neither of these two questions is satisfactorily answered by such definitions. If it is admitted that the illusion of a snake in a rope is due to ignorance, the question still remains : what is the ignorance due to ? What is the nature of ignorance which deludes the entire world ? This is a mystery, and anyone who is able to solve it achieves salvation. Possibly, it is because of this that Shankaracharya declared it to be indeterminable and made an escape. But the question still remains : why, after all, does it arise and why does the soul or Brahman become deluded ? This question remained unanswered in Shankara's philosophy. The Sankhya philosopher Maharishi Kapil attempted a solution. He states that "non-discrimination is the nature (dharama) or innate tendency of internal organ (*Chitta*) and because of this, it becomes conjoined with prakrati or matter and the other false apprehensions arise because of the companionship with matter."[34] Like Shankara, Sankhya philosophy also propounds that non-discrimination is not an element, but it disagrees with Shankara's philosophy when it declares non-discrimination to be a state of *chitta*.[35] The reason is that Shankara advocates that ignorance is infinite, eternal and natural.[36] Even this does not solve the problem If non-discrimination is a quality of *chitta*, then, because of the fact that an attribute is inseparable from that which is attributed, must always reside in the *chitta* and since *chitta* exists with the soul, then non-discrimi-

nation or ignorance will always exist in purusha. Consequently, the very possibility of salvation is negated by this Sankhya contention.

Swami Dayananda's view on this issue is that "the soul is the knower of truth and falsehood, and it tends towards false knowledge because of obstinacy, wrong pursuits, ignorance and the desire to achieve its purpose."[37] Besides, "since the soul is finite by its very nature, it is covered with ignorance."[38] These two statements contain two important conceptions. The first is that the soul is the knower of both truth and falsehood, which implies that the soul possesses the power to distinguish between true and false knowledge. Secondly, on the other hand, after coming in the body and becoming involved in material pursuits, it tends towards false knowledge to gain pleasure, because by its very nature, it is possessed of limited knowledge. **Ignorance thus has its orgin in the fact of the soul's limited knowledge, and it is this ignorance which gives rise to false perception.** Dayananda's reference to the soul's limited knowledge implies that the soul does possess the power to obtain knowledge, but it can never become omniscient like God. The omniscient, that is, one who knows everything, would never become entangled in sensual and material pleasures. **It is only the soul, which, because of its limited knowledge, becomes involved in such pleasures and consequently falsely perceives one thing in another, and this is the source of ignorance.** In Dayananda's philosophy, ignorance is not an indeterminable element which can be referred to either as both true and false or as neither.

Causes of False Perception—Why does false perception arise ? On this issue, Dayananda agrees with the Vaisheshika view that it arises either because of some defect in the senses or because of wrong mental impressions, or because of the conjunction of both.[39] Some illusions arise purely because of defects of sense organs, for instance, when the eyes are yellow, every thing appears to be yellow. In this kind of false perception, mental impressions play no part. On the other hand, some false perceptions, such as hallucinations, are due entirely to false mental impressions. Besides, some kinds of false perception arise from a combination of these two factors. For instance, defective eyes perceive the conch (*seepi*), while the prior impression of silver in the mind leads to the false perception of silver in the conch.

Jayanta Bhatta classifies false perceptions into those which arise because of the senses and those which arise because of the mind. Of the two, the first is due to some defect in the sense organ and is with some basis (*salamba*), while the latter is without basis (niralmba). The first is an illusion and the latter a hallucination [40] Sridhara further divides the first category into the indeterminate (nirvikalpa) and the determinate (*savikalpa*). He points out that the first type of illusions are exclusively due to defective sense organs, as in the case of a patient suffering from jaundice who perceives everything to be yellow. While the second is due to a conjunction of defective sense organs and false mental impressions, as in the case of perceiving a snake in a piece of rope. A false perception, which arises because defective eyes do not perceive the rope suitably, and this imperfect perception then blends with the already existing mental impression of a snake to produce the illusion.[41] The third kind ot illusions are the (*niralamba*) illusions which have no basis outside the perceiver. On this subject, one cannot find any notable difference of opinion between Swami Dayananda and these scholars.

Jayanta Bhatta explains that illusions involve many external and other defects in the object. For instance, in visual perception the adequacy or inadequacy of light may give rise to an illusion. In the same way, illusions may arise because of similarity, motion, distance and other factors. The perception of the snake in the rope belongs to this category. In the same way, the spokes of a rapidly rotating wheel cannot be perceived because of rapid motion, while the moon apearing to be much smaller than its actual size is due to the distance. Although Swami Dayananda has not delved so deep into the subtleties of false knowledge, there is no apparent reason to perceive any lack of consistency between his views and those expressed above. His major objection is to the view of the neo-vedantists, who describe false knowledge as indeterminable or *anrirvachniya*.

Vedantists belonging to the Shankara tradition contend that the substances of illusion are neither false nor true, they neither possess existence, nor lack it, and hence they are indeterminable, therefore, their theory of error is called Anirvachniya Khyati. According to this system of thought, all those substances which

are enlightened by knowledge are the subjects of knowledge. In the false perception of silver in the conch, the object is silver, and it is because of this that awareness of silver arises. The Vedantists argue that if the Nyaya philosophers contend that in a state of illusion, the observer obtains the knowledge of something in something else, then why the conch gives rise to an awareness of silver alone and not something other than silver. By arguing that the substance of illusion are unreal, they imply that silver does not truly exist in the conch. Because, if it did, then its perception should not have been nullified by a later perception. It is also not non-existent, because if it were, it could not give rise to the perception of silver. And, it cannot simultaneously be existent and non-existent, because then both objections would also apply simultaneously, Consequently, the perception of silver in the conch is indeterminable.[42] Shankara defines superimposition as "imagining the existence of something, in this, that does not exist,"[43] implying thereby the perception of non-existence or a non-object in existence or an object. In other words, it amounts to perceiving the non-existent snake, which is a non-object, in the rope that exists and hence is an object.

Swami Dayananda directs our attention to a fault in the reasoning of those Vedantists who propagate the view that false perception is indeterminable. He says to them, "you (the Vedantist thinkers) become enmeshed in error by arguing that the rope is an object and the snake a non-object. Is the snake not an object ? If you argue that the snake is not in the rope, but it exists at other place and that its impression is imprinted on the mind, then the snake no longer remains a non-object." In this argument, Swami Dayananda's purpose is to elucidate the fact that the illusion of the snake in the rope arises from the false perception of the rope and due to the awareness of the similarity between the snake and the rope, there becomes the recollection of the past impressions of a snake imprinted on one's consciousness. This is to perceive something in something else, it does not involve the perception of a non-object in an object. The reason behind this line of thought is that the snake seen in the past is not a non-object. This then becomes similar to the Nyayaika concept of Anyatha-Khyati, i. e. to perceive something in something else, with which Swami Dayananda is completely agreed.

Sri Ramanuja also refutes the Vedantist doctrine of illusion of *anirvachniya-khyati* on the basis of numerous arguments and simultaneously establishes his concept of sat-khyati i.e. error is not totally false. In the false perception of silver in the conch, the silver is a real, existing substance, because it is impossible to perceive a non-extstent object. Upto this point Sri Ramanuja and Swami Dayananda are in agreement. Ramanuja then goes on to argue that false knowledge does not arise because of the similarity between silver and conch, because this can only arouse or activate the impressions of silver imprinted on our mind, and this is memory. This does not lead to the perception of silver. He than adds that silver has a predominance of the element of fire, and silver resides in the coach in a certain degree, while the conch enjoys a predominance of the earth element. Besides, it is an established principle that one object is similar to another only when the first exists to a certain degree in the second. Consequently, silver does exist to some extent in the conch. It is because of this that their similarity is observed As a result, it is these elements of silver in the conch which give rise to the perception of silver. If this contention is accepted, it is obvious enough to ask why the perception of silver in the conch is than referred to as false knowledge, since Ramanuja contends that silver, does, in fact exist in the conch to some extent. Ramanuja's answer is that conch contains silver to such an extent that it cannot function as silver.[44] Consequently, this perception is considered false perception.

It appears that Ramanuja, because of his obssessive desire to refute Shankara's concept of error as indeterminable, which is the attribution of some non-object on an object, wishes to prove that silver exists in the conch so as to justify the similarity between the two. But this argument is contrary both to fact and practice. On the other hand, Swami Dayananda's refutation of Shankara's view does not suffer from this shortcoming. He does not accept the silver in the conch as a real or true object, but ins'ead argues that silver, which was perhaps earlier perceived in a jeweller's shop, is a real object existing in such a shop, and its impression upon the consciousness is real in the form of an impression. He contends that because of the environment, the conch glitters like silver, and when this glitter [is perceived, it is the

impression of silver that is recollected. The result is that conch appears to be silver. It can be contended against this that recollection of impressions can only lead to awakening of memory and not to a perception of silver. The answer to this objection is that even in dreams, our impressions appear to possess the concrete shapes of real objects. What can be the objection to positing the same in the case of false perception ? But such an argument is not palatable to the Vedantists, because it does not support a monistic theory, since Swami Dayananda presumes the exis ence of impressions for illusion or dream, and such an impression can be obtained only during a waking state. Thus, we see that Swami Dayananda succeeds in eliminating the errors in the arguments of Shankara and Ramanuja by accepting that false knowledge involves the perception of something in something else, and thus he re-establishes the Nyaya concept of anyatha-khyati i.e. the cognition of something in something else.

Nature of True Knowledge

Swami Dayananda defines knowledge as true cognition of real nature of a thing (यथार्थ दर्शनं ज्ञानमिति). Swami Shankara's definition of true knowledge is that any cognition, which is not sublated by any other cognition, constitutes true knowledge. Swami Dayananda has no quarrel with this definition because the truthful or real perception of a substance constitutes knowledge of its nature. Perceiving the silver as silver, conch as a conch and a mirage as a mirage is true cognition. But Shankaracharya contends that the entire universe is one big illusion, which, in his opinion, is sublated by the knowledge of reality of the transcendental level, just as awareness of the rope sublates the illusion of a snake. But Dayananda's definition of true knowledge is not related to any level of existence, instead, he comprehends under it the knowledge of the real nature of all the substances that exist in this entire universe and beyond it.

What precisely he means by true knowledge is clarified thus, by Swami Dayananda : "that which produces cognition of the real nature of substances is knowledge, while that cognition which does not create true knowledge of the nature of substances and instead creates awareness of one thing in another is

ignorance."[46] The fact, that every piece of knowledge obtained through the senses does not constitute true knowledge, has already been stated in a preceeding section. But, in addition to this, there is also the fact that false knowledge is the result of many other factors apart from the senses. From this we learn that the senses can obtain knowledge, but that it is limited to a perception only of attributes. In consequence, the senses never come into direct contact with the substance and thus the substance is able to conceal from our scrutiny its real nature. But as far as the attributes are concerned, the perception of the senses is real. Thus the senses succeed partially in perceiving the nature of the substance. When Swami Dayananda designates apprehension of the real nature of substances as true knowledge, the implication is that the perception, whether through the senses or through the mind, should be capable of comprehending the real form or nature of the substance. Consequently, the extent to which the senses can apprehend, the extent to which they can provide awareness of the substance, is the extent to which they can provide real knowledge. Swami Dayananda's views here differ from Shankaracharya's. Shankaracharya postulates that the entire universe is an illusion, and hence every perception at the practical level would necessarily be illusory, because it would be refuted at the transcendental level. In normal perception and within the sphere of the senses, the existence of the substance is inferred from the attributes perceived, but the highly developed and trained mind possessing powers of Yoga, possesses the ability to obtain the knowledge of substances and their real nature. The knowledge, that ordinary mind apprehends, is of mere cover, which is penetrated by the trained mind to arrive at the core of the substance, For instance, for the ordinary mind, a piece of gold is gold, but for the scientific mind, it is a conglomeration of the atoms of gold, which have a specific nature. But for the highly trained scientific mind, these atoms are composed of a specific number of electrons, protons and neutrons and by changing their number, the atoms of gold can be converted into atoms of some other element. Undoubtedly, the highly trained scientific mind is extremely sharp and incisive, but even the ordinary mind is also capable within its own limits, since it perceives a piece of gold as gold. Knowledge of this world is not similar to the illusion of a

snake in a piece of rope. In this way, the knowledge, successively, of this universe, the soul and finally Brahman or God, the perception of their essential natures, constitutes the final limits of true knowledge. Whosoever is able to attain to this level of true knowledge arrives at a stage, as the Upanishadas declare, in which all his doubts are destroyed.[46] Consequently, the person who possesses true knowledge is able to destroy all his doubts about substances because he is able to perceive their real nature.

In his definition of ignorance, Swami Dayananda agrees with Patanjali that ignorance consists in perceiving the eternality in transience, purity in impurity, pleasure in pain and consciousness in unconsciousness. This itself establishes the fact that he, who perceives transience in the transients, impurity in impurity, sufferings in sufferings and unconsciousness in unconsciousness, possesses true knowledge. In other words, knowing substances as they are, alone, is true knowledge.[47] This definition can be applied to any and every substance. This same knowledge is referred to by Vaisheshika philosophers as defective and non-defective (*dushta and adushta*) knowledge[48] and the Sankhyathinkers as discrimination and non-discrimination (*viveka and aviveka*). Dayananda's concept comprehends within itself Shankara's concept of true knowledge as being not sublated, because the real is never refuted, but at the same time it also comprehends the recognition of the false as false. The refutation of false knowledge by later knowledge does not prove its non-existence, instead it establishes its existence. Consequently, we must attemptto discover what false knowledge is and how it arises. It is because of this that Swami Dayananda declares, "the person who knows simultaneously the nature of knowledge and ignorance is able to overcome death by or following the path of Karma or action (*karmopasna*) and achieve salvation through real knowledge."[49]

8

PSYCHOLOGY

The Foundation of Dayananda's Views on Psychology

The concept of '*mind*' is of especial significance in Indian psychology. It is through the mind that the soul is related to the body. It is the mind that functions like a mirror and converts the impressions of the senses into knowledge. It is through contemplation of mind that yogis achieve spiritual knowledge.

The powers and functions of the mind are elaborately described in the *Shivsankalpa Sukta*, whose deity is the mind, in the thirty-fourth chapter of the Yajurveda. Swami Dayananda's views on the mind and elements of psychology are founded upon this sukta of the Yajurveda as well as the mantras of the Rigveda and Atharvaveda concerning the mind. In the Upanishadas, description of the mind, mental powers and the functions of the mind are to be found in numerous places. In his Yoga philosophy, Patanjali uses the term '*chitta*' in place of mind. *Chitta* is sometimes translated as consciousness which is incorrect. *Chitta* means that instrument which creates awareness of substances to soul. Maharishi Kapil has used the word '*budhi*' or 'intellect' itself for the mind. In his Yoga philosophy, Patanjali has succeeded in giving a scientific form to the elements of psychological knowledge scattered here and there in Upanishadic mantras. And, the fact that he has used the term 'chitta' for mind does not, therefore, involve any conflict between his views and those expressed in other Vedic texts.

Swami Dayananda's psychological views have their roots in the psychological theory propounded in the Vedas, Upanishadas and the six systems of Indian philosophical thought. The pro-

found psychology evolved in the Yoga philosophy of Maharishi Patanjali is one which is accepted as a pioneering attempt not only by Vedic sects but even by non-Vedic schools of thought. Since Swami Dayananda is the supreme seeker after truth, there was no reason why he should not have accepted Patanjali's views. As in the case of other texts, the Yoga-Sutras have also been the subject of numerous commentaries, but Dayananda accepts only Vyas' commentary as the authoritative one. Not merely this, at certain points, he can be seen making certain amendments even in this commentary.

The originality of Dayananda's views on psychology is implicit in the Vedic foundation of the psychological view he propagated. What is the mind ? How is the mind related to the body ? What are its functions ? What is its importance in our life ? Swami Dayananda seeks to answer these and related questions with the help of six mantras of the Shiva-Sankalpa-Sukta, given and translated below.

यज्जाग्रतो दूरमुदैति दैवन्तदु सुप्तस्य तथैवैति ।
दूरङ्गम ज्योतिषां ज्योतिरेकन्तन्मे मनः शिव संकल्पमस्तु ।।१।।
येन कर्माण्यपसो मनीषिणो यज्ञे कृण्वन्ति विदथेषु धीराः ।
यदपूर्वं यक्षमन्तः प्रजानां तन्मे मनः शिव संकल्पमस्तु ।।२।।
यत्प्रज्ञानमुत चेतो धृतिश्च यज्जोतिरन्तरमृतं प्रजासु ।
यस्मान्न ऋते किंचन कर्म क्रियते तन्मे मनः शिव संकल्पमस्तु ।।३।।
येनेदं भूतं भुवनं भविष्यत्परिगृहीतममृतेन सर्वम् ।
येन यज्ञस्तायते सप्तहोता तन्मे मनः शिव संकल्पमस्तु ।।४।।
यस्मिन्नृचः सामयजुंषि यस्मिन्प्रतिष्ठिता रथनाभाविवाराः ।
यस्मिंश्चित्तं सर्वमोतं प्रजानां तन्मे मनः शिव संकल्पमस्तु ।।५।।
सुषारथिरश्वानिव यन्मनुष्यान्नेनीयतेऽभीशुभिर्वाजिनइव ।
हृत्प्रतिष्ठं यदजिरं जविष्ठं तन्मे मनः शिव संकल्पमस्तु ।।६।।

(1) May this mind of mine, which is the light of all lights, which travels afar in the waking state, which is possessed of many astonishing powers and attributes, which attains also to the state of sleep and which in a state of dreaming enacts travel to distant places, be filled with true determinations and righteousness.

(2) May this mind of mine, through which wise people indulge in virtuous deeds and which is possessed of unique capabilities and which exists within all living beings (*praja*), be inclined to form pure determinations.

(3) May this mind of mine, without which no living being can indulge in any deed, which lives in living beings as a source of enlightenment, which determines the character of things and make determination, which is beyond destruction, be the knower of true knowledge.

(4) May my mind, by means of which yogins achieve knowledge of the past, present and future, by means of which the indestructible jiva or soul identifies with God and achieves knowledge of all dimensions, by means of which the body has knowledge and power of activity and that which is associated with the five sense organs, the reason and the soul, be filled with true and pure determinations.

(5) May my mind be inclined towards welfare and philanthropy, that mind in which the Rigveda, Yajurveda Samaveda and Atharvaveda reside, jnst as the spokes are fixed to the hub of the wheel of a chariot, that mind which exists inside all living beings illuminating them with knowledge.

(6) May my mind, which controls all living beings as the reigns are used by the charioteer to control and guide his horses, which resides in the heart and which is mobile and capable of excessive speed, be possessed of virtuous attributes.

It is almost impossible to come across a more subtle and excellent description of the nature of mind and its functions in the entire range of Vedic and non-Vedic literature. It has been said in the preceding mantras that the mind resides in the heart of living creatures and its main function is to associate or create a relationship between the body and the soul. The mind possesses an astonishing capacity for obtaining and retaining knowledge. The five sense organs, the five organs of action, the five vital forces and the brain all work under its control and according to its direction. The mind continues to exist in all the three stages of wakefulness, sleeping and dreaming. A mind disciplined

through yoga gains the ability to discover knowledge concerning the past, the present and the future. Through yoga, the mind becomes capable of obtaining knowledge of the subtle elements and substances. In a pure mind, the Vedas, which are the knowledge of God, flow naturally. These mantras of the Yajurveda contain, in the form of a seed, all the assumptions and conclusions of Vedic psychology. The seers who composed the Upanishadas only elaborated in their texts, the knowledge contained therein and embellished by their own experience.

In addition to this, the Rigveda also contains many mantras that ordain that the mind must be controlled and established in God. The Rigveda declares, "Establish your mind in God."[1] This implies that, according to the Rigveda, the mind can help obtaining the knowledge of God. Many other mantras of similar intent can be discovered broadcast throughout the Vedas, some of which have been selected by Swami Dayananda for his "Rigvedadi-Bhashya-Bhumika."

The Shiva-Sankalpa-Sukta contains a definite account of the existence, functions and powers of the mind, in addition to which the fundamental assumptions of psychology and the advantages that the human race can derive from a study of mind, are also elaborately explained. Besides this, it has also been declared therein that no action by any living being is conceivable in the absence of the mind. In view of this, it was only natural that Vedic seers should have been inspired and made curious to discover the astounding powers of the mind. But, at the same time, we should also keep in the mind that the Vedas employ the word 'mind' for the that entire apparatus residing within the body which has been referred to by later philosophers by the word '*antahakarna*' or internal organ.

Four Fold Internal Organ (*antahakarana chatyushtya*)—In consonance with earlier philosophers and commentators, Swami Dayananda also divides the *internal organ*, **from the viewpoint of function, into four parts—mind, reason, power of memory and ego** (*mana, buddhi, chitta, ahamkara*). Swami Dayananda described these four respectively as discursive-intellect, reason, memory and ego.[2] **The function of the mind** is to make knowledge. It oscillates between alternatives. With reference to the body, its main

function is to obtain sensory knowledge through the sense organs and to instruct the organs of action to respond accordingly. Sankhya philosophy shares this conception.[3] In modern psychology, the behaviourism of Watson presumes this stimulus and response as the entire gamut of human psychology. They made no attempt to discover who the agent is behind the decisions and choices of alternatives that occur in the brain. We find that the sensations derived in the indeterminate state of perception provide no knowledge about the subject. If anything is discovered, it is that these are sensations, but without any awareness of the object from which they proceed. When these sensations coalesce in the mind, it is the mind that unites or combines them and then the realization dawns that these are the sensations of this object. This is the determinate state (*savikalpak*) of perception. At this stage, in process of knowing, the knower is aware not only of the sensations, but he is aware of his mental decisions about the underlying substance also, which assist him in determining the nature of the object. Any such decision is inconceivable without a conscious knower, because a decision involves recognizing an object as 'this' and 'not this', while in the sphere of action, it involves choosing one form of action instead of another. In Swami Shankaracharya's view, the conscious being has three characteristics—whether he should indulge in a particular act, not indulge in it, or indulge in the very opposite of it. Voluntary choice of an act as desirable proves that the behaviour of human being constitutes not merely the response to a stimulus (which is Watson's conception of it), but living decisions guided by the power that chooses between alternatives, modes and decides upon one of them. And it is the mind that with the inspiration of the conscious power of the soul involves itself in actions. The **second differentiation of the *antahakaran* is the reason.** The reason possesses the ability to form definitive knowledge. It is free from doubt. **When the internal organ indulges in the act of remembering, it is memory** (*chitta*). All the activities indulged in by the mind assume the form of impressions (*sanskaras*) and enter the internal organ (*Antahakaran*), from where the *chitta* can recover them in the form of memories. Waston conceives of memory as a pure sensory-motor activity, but he does not explain where and how

various impressions coalesce and how, when required, they return. In addition, we often have the experience that when we are sitting quietly, some memory totally unconnected with the existing environment and thus inexplicable in terms of any perceivable stimulus, flashes into the mind. Watson's conception of memory as a sensory-motor act completely fails to provide any convincing explanation of such a very common human experience. Dayananda and many other Vedic philosophers believe that memories subsist in the *antahakaran* and that they are mental states (*chitta-vratti*). **The fourth function of the *antahakaran* is ego.** Recognizing itself and identifying oneself as distinct from other entities is the function of the ego. I am, as a matter of course, acquainted with my own activities, feelings, emotions and sensations, but in addition, I also believe that I am a separate being capable of knowing. Descartes expressed the same idea in his now famous dictum, "I think, therefore, I am." But Dayananda would prefer to re-interpret this as "I am, therefore, I think." It is this sense of 'I' or 'I am' which constitutes the ego.

Though his description of four fold internal organ (अन्तःकरण चतुष्टय) Swami Dayananda does not imply that the mind, reason, memory (chitta) and ego are four separate parts or elements and their conjunction constitutes the internal organ. In fact, the four constitute the four separate powers or functions of the internal organ. In this way, Dayananda's psychological theory is a comprehensive one, since it includes all the sensory-motor activities. It also includes the memory, judgement and the ego, the impressions that reside in the mind and the powerful tendencies that arise in the mind. In addition, it also encompasses the control over mental forces for the good of life and finally emancipation.

The Subtle Body

The Vedic concept, which is also reflected in the Upanishads, concerning the human body is that apart from the corporeal body which is visible, there are three other bodies concealed within it. Swami Dayananda has brought to light this Vedic and Upanishadic concept Swami Dayananda declares, "There

are three bodies, the first is gross body, which is visible, The second is the constitute of seventeen elements—the five vital forces, the five sense organs, the five subtle elements, mind and reason—**it is called the** *subtle body*. This subtle body remains with the soul through life and death. **It has two variants. The first is material,** and it is composed of parts or atoms of subtle elements *(bhoota)*. **The second is natural**, in other words, which is constituted of the natural attributes of the soul. The latter non-corporeal body continues to exist even in the state of salvation. It is through this body that the jiva experiences the bliss of salvation. **The third** is *causal body* which experiences deep sleep, by virtue of its being of the nature of prakrati, is universal and hence it is the same for all souls."[4]

The functions of the corporeal body are controlled by the subtle body and the impressions of actions and objects of experience pass into the *antahkaran* existing in the subtle body. A person's day to day life is determined by the nature of the continuum of his impressions. The impressions subsisting in the subtle body constitute the individual's habits and sentiments, and it is of these impressions that the sub-conscious and the unconscious mind are constituted. Repressions through social and ethical restraints lead these powerful impressions to give rise to various mental diseases and complexes in life. Unrelated thoughts and impressions achieve coherence only when they enter the subtle body. Memory is an act whereby, when the occasion demands, some of these impressions are allowed to emerge to the level of consciousness.

Five Vital Forces—The subtle body contains within itself five vital forces that occasion the various functions of the body. Of these, the first is '*prana*' which conducts exhalation of life breath, the second '*apana*' it draws the life breath inwards from outside, third '*Sama a*' which resides in the navel (*nabhi*) in the gross body and carries various juices to spread through the body, the fourth '*udana*' by means of which the food in the gullet is drawn into the body and fifth '*vyana*' through which the body makes all its efforts and engages in activity.[5]

Five Sense Organs—In addition to these five vital forces, the five sense organs subsist in the subtle body in the form of

forces or energy. In Dayananda's conception, the five sense organs mentioned with reference to the subtle body do not refer to the skin, eyes, ears, tongue and nose of the gross body, but to their subtle powers residing in subtle body. In Indian psychology, this distinction between the five sense organs and their subtle energy form, is one of considerable importance. The gross sense organs become functional only when they receive the energy from their subtle forms. Sankhya philosophy believes that these five sense organs originate from the ego (ahamkara), and that they come into existence before the five gross elements (bhootas), along with the five subtle elements (panchtanmatras). Although modern para-psychology does not accept the concept of the subtle energies of the sense organs, but their existence is established by such unquestionable experiences as extra-sensory-perception, knowledge of the contents of another's mind, ability to see what is not before one's eyes and many other experiences of this nature. In extra-sensory perception, the gross senses do not come into direct contact with the object, and consequently, psychologically speaking, such an experience cannot be called sensory perception. How does such perception occur ? Indian psychology enunciates the view that it is the subtle forces of sense organs that perceive distant objects through their astounding powers. Under normal conditions, these subtle senses perform their work through the medium of the gross senses and the nervous system. But through yogic discipline, the subtle senses can be trained to function independently of the gross senses.

The five subtle elements (Suksham bhoota), mind and intellect – The subtle body also contains five subtle elements (Suksham bhoota), that is, sound, form, taste, touch and smell, which are also referred to as the 'panchtanmatra'. Apart from these fifteen constituents (the five vital forces, the five sense organs and the five subtle elements), the subtle body also possesses the mind and the intellect and thus it has seventeen constituents. Swami Dayananda further differentiates between the physical and the non-physical subtle body. The preceding description relates to the former. The latter, or the non-physical subtle body, is a constitute of the natural attributes of the soul. And it is this "second non-physical subtle body that exists even in salvation."[6]

Causal Body (*Karana-Sharira*)

In addition to the above, Swami Dayananda's works also contain references to another body, the *Karana-Sharira*, which "by virtue of being of the nature of prakrati, is universal and is one and the same for all souls."[7] It is because of the presence of this body that the internal organ, laden with tamas, succumbs to the state of profound sleep.

The Mind and the Senses

Like the Sankhya thinkers, Swami Dayananda also considers the mind as one of the senses, through which the soul establishes contact with the external world through the medium of the gross senses. Between the mind and the senses exists the power of '*prana*' or vital force. This vital force constantly flows through the entire body in its five forms - *prana, apana, samana, vyana and udana.* Its five subdivisions are known by the names *naga, kurma davadatta, krakkala and dhananjaya.* 'Prana' is that power in the body which grants mobility and dynamism to the body and throbs in every cell and every nerve. This power of 'prana' is controlled by the mind. Dayananda's view is that when the soul wants to indulge in an act, "the soul joins with the mind to inspire the prana and thus it turns the mind towards evil or virtuous deeds."[8] It is the prana which grants the sense organs their power to act and function, and thus, the mind activates the senses through the prana.

In Swami Dayananda's view, the mind is not a conscious entity. Instead, he argues, as do other Vedic systems of philosophic thought, that the mind, being a mutation of prakrati, is an inert substance.[9] However, it appears to be conscious because of its conjunction with the soul's inherent power of consciousness. It begins to act only when inspired by the soul's power. The mind acts as a medium for the conjuction of the soul and the body. The mind does not enter into any direct contact with external objects; this contact belongs to the sphere of the senses. The senses then communicate the sensations aroused by their contact with objects to the nerves, which in turn, convey the sensations to the mind.[10] After this, the mind, bringing into focus its various powers such as judgement, selection, memory, etc., as

well as its memory of previosuly experienced sensations, determines the nature of the object. It relates the present experience to some prior perception, consequently its decisions also involve the memory of past experiences.

The mind, being the controller of the prana, is able to exercise control over the sense organs. The senses are susceptible to the influence of even the subtlest wave of thought arising in the mind. How the mind maintains its supremacy over the senses is explained in Swami Dayananda's commentary on a Vedic mantra in which he says, "the mind compels the individual to move hither and thither constantly just as the reigns of a horse in the hands of its rider compel the horse to move to the rider's will."[11] But when the senses become habituated to a certain activity, then, like powerful and wayward horses, they forcibly drag the mind towards the objects. In such a condition, the mind accords its assent spontaneously towards the objects of sensuous gratification. This happens when the mind is weak.

The influence of Satva, Rajas and Tamas on the Mind and the Sense Organs

Influence of Satva, Rajas and Tamas on the body and the mind—From the most subtle to the most gross, all objects in this universe are basically only mutations of the three attributes satva, rajas and tamas. Consequently, the human body, mind and sense organs are also the evolutes of these three entities. According to the Sankhya conception, the 'mahat', which they refer to as the universal conscience, originates from the purest satva element, the entity which is symbolic of light, knowledge and purity. The mind and the ten sense organs emerge from the ego full of satva (*satvic ahankara*). However, the other two elements, rajas and tamas exist in a suppressed state in the sense organs.'[2] In contrast, the elements that constitute the body have a preponderance of the tamas element. Swami Dayananda accepts without modification the Sankhya principle of division of the three attributes or elements and the origin of the material and conscious universe from them. Consequently, it becomes logically necessary for him to accept that the mind and the corporeal body are influenced by these three elements. The Sankhya principle of the division of attributes into

three (*gunatraya*) is an astonishing contribution of a scientific nature, because of which the other Vedic philosophies, despite their divergence on other issues, have also been compelled to accept the validity of the Sankhya concept of three attributes. For instance, both Swami Shankara and Ramanujacharya are staunch opponents of the dualism of Sankhya and they vigorously castigate it as being an atheistic system of thought, but even they accept the division of satva, rajas and tamas. The substances out of which the mind, the sense organs and the body are made, are also the substances out of which all the other objects of the world have evolved. Thus, it is inevitable that the body and mind be influenced by them. In fact, this concept that these three attributes influence human life, is a fundamental principle of Vedic psychology on which is founded not only the activities of human beings, but also of entire living beings of the world.

How is our conduct influenced by satva, rajas and tamas? In his answer to this question, Swami Dayananda, describing the existence and preponderance of these three attributes in the human body, explains, "when the soul is possessed of knowledge, it should be known to have satva, when it has ignorance, tamas should be inferred and when the soul is involved in attachment and aversion then it should be taken to denote the preponderance of rajas attribute".[13] Although all the three attributes have an influence upon us in many various ways, but in any one period, it is the influence of one that predominates, while the other two become secondary. In the period in which "one specific attribute exists in predominance in the body", "that attribute changes the bodily and mental states of the jiva according to itself"[14] The influence that the attributes have on and the condition which the individual experiences because of the dominance of one attribute can be understood in this way. Dayananda explains, "when the soul is suffused with contentment and the mind conducts itself with peace akin to pure knowledge, then one should understand that the satva attribute is dominating, while rajas and tamas occupy a secondary position. When the soul and mind are full of sorrow, and wander here and there without pleasure and happiness, understand that it is the rajas attribute that dominates, while satva and tamas are secondary. When the mind and soul are occupied with worldly things and are full of

attachment, when they lack discrimination, when they are indulged in sensuous objects and when they lack rational power, it should be known definitely that it is the tamas attribute which dominates me, while satva and rajas are subsidiary. Now the three fold results of these three attributes, in the form of good, medium and inferior are explaind in their entirety. The characteristics of the satva attribute are study of the Vedas, involvement in virtuous deeds, increase in knolwedge, desire for purity, rejection of the senses, spiritual reflection, etc. When the rajas attribute assumes a dominant condition while the satva and tamas sink into subordination, there is increase in interest, abandonment of patience, indulge in sinful or non-truthful deeds, constant tendency towards sensuous objects, and then it should be understood that one is being dominated by the rajas attribute. When the tamas attribute dominates and the other two become subordinate, then there is an excess of greed, an increase in sinful deeds, excessive laziness and sleep, destruction of patience, increase in cruelty, dearth of faith in God and the Vedas, absence of concentration, indulgence in evil things and habits Then the learned must know that the tamas element dominates. Besides when one feels that one's soul indulges in or experiences a desire to indulge in actions that lead to shame, uncertainty and fear, it should be known that the tamas attribute is predominating in one's self. When in this world, one's soul desires fame and even in his poverty does not give up the practice of giving alms to the flatterers etc., it should be known that the rajas element dominates. And when an individual always desire to learn from everyone, goes on adopting new qualities, does not feel ashamed of indulging in virtuous deeds and other actions which give pleasure to the soul and thus has interest only in good deeds, you should know that the satva attribute predominates your soul. The characteristic of tamas attribute is indulgence in sensuality, that of rajas is desire for aggrandizement of wealth and that of satva is practise of virtue, but rajas is superior to tamas, while satva is superior to rajas."[15] The satva attribute provides knowledge and enlightenment, rajas jealousy and tamas ignorance.

Swami Dayananda has already made it clear that all the objects of prakrati are the modifications of these three attributes. Consequently, all objects used by living beings also produce the

effects of three attributes. Food, clothes, mode of living and the surrounding environment influence human beings according to their composition. For instance, natural beauty is productive of mental peace. Food also produces similar effects. Highly spiced food gives a predominance of rajas, fresh fruits produce satva while stale food arouses a tamasic tendency. In his chapter on vegetarianism, Swami Dayananda points out these three qualities with respect to food and explains that "the nature of the non-vegetarian becomes cruel."[16] According to the dominance of the one or the other attribute, the individual's soul, his conscience and his tendencies assume a corresponding character.

The mental impressions subsisting in the conscience continue to flow like the flow of a river, because of which the soul experiences pain, pleasure, rebirth, etc. Concerning the conditions to which individuals attain after their death, according to the dominance of the satva, rajas or tamas elements in their conscience and concerning different states and position in which they are reborn, Swami Dayananda provides an extensive description based on Manu-Smriti. Its basic contention is that "those who possess the satva element attain the condition of devas or learned scholars, those who possess rajas attain that of ordinary persons, while those who possess the tamas element arrive at a low condition."[17] In this way, the satva element is superior to the other elements. But whatever the element, it invariably constitutes bondage. Just as a person is bound, irrespective of the fact that the chains fettering him are made of iron or gold. No individual can attain salvation without the destruction of these bonds. It is because of this that Swami Dayananda advises that the other two elements should be suppressed through encouragement of the satva element, but he directs that later on, one must win one's liberation even from the satva element. He declares, "the individual must stop his mind from indulging in acts dominated by the rajas and tamas, and thus he must make his mind full of the satva element. Later on, he must shed even the satva element and concentrate his mind in God and virtuous deeds, which should be in the forefront of his consciousness. In other words, he must stop the mind's tendency to flow in any direction. When the mind is stopped from flowing in any direction at all, then the soul becomes situated in God, who is the knower of all."[18] Before arriving at this condition, the

bondage created by any one of the three elements prevents the soul from becoming anchored in God.

Yoga and Mental Discipline

The minds of living beings (which is referred to as 'chitta' in Yoga philosophy) is an astonishing instrument, which is constantly engaged in some or the other activity. This constantly changing tendency of the mind has been referred to by Yoga philosophers as '*chittavratti*' or modification of the mind. Such modifications of the mind are innumerable, as Vachaspati states. But Yoga philosophers have categorized them into five classes, a classification with which Swami Dayananda is in complete agreement. The five modifications are—*pramana, viparyaya, vikalpa, nidra and smriti.*

Pramana **or Valid Sources of Knowledge**—Yoga philosophy accepts three valid sources of knowledge—perception, inference and scripture or testimony. But Swami Dayananda accepts eight valid sources of knowledge, inclusive of the three mentioned above. These have already been considered in an earlier chapter.

Viparyaya **or False Knowledge**—That which constitutes false knowledge, implying the failure to accept a thing as it is or being conscious of one object in another constitutes *viparyaya* or false knowledge.

Vikalpa **or Imagination**—"that which has a sound or word, but the meaning of which is beyond discovery by anyone" is vikalpa.

Nidra **or Sleep**—"the tendency which is stuck in the darkness of ignorance." Here Swami Dayananda implicitly refers to a state of the mind in which the mind is deeply immersed in the profound darkness of the tamas, a state akin to that of profound sleep. In this state, because of the density of the tamas, the jiva is beyond even dreams and consciousness is almost absent. Vyas is of the view that after arising from it, all that is experienced is comfort and lethargy. This shows that even during sleep the mind exists in a specific state and hence even this is one of the modifications of the mind.

Smriti **or Memory**—"When some behaviour or object is perceived, and an impression of it is retained in knowledge and is

not forgotten, the mental mode thus exhibited is called memory."[19] Vyas explains that memory is of two kinds—waking and alseep. Dayananda does not elucidate this subject any further. (But he regards Vyas' commentary on Yoga philosophy as authoritative, and hence we are inclined to the view that Dayananda's views do not contradict the ideas of Vyas).

Five Kleshas or Afflictions—The forementioned five mental modifications are either full of afflictions or without afflictions. Through the former Swami Dayananda implies those modifications which have their origin in such afflictions as ignorance, but the Yogis engaged in worship possess mental modifications which are free from such defects and are hence filled with peace.[20] The five kleshas are *avidya* (ignorance), *asmita* (egoism), *raga* (attachment), *dvesha* (aversion) and *abhinivesha* (fear from death). According to Swami Dayananda, ignorance or *avidya* is constituted of "perceiving eternity in an impermanent world and the body etc..., perceiving the purity in the impure things, pleasure in suffering and knowledge of the soul in the material."[21] "Not regarding the separately present intellect as separate from the soul, constitutes *asmita*, attachment in pleasure is called '*raga*', hatred for suffering is called '*dvesha*' and fear from the pain of death is called '*abhinivesha*'.[22] However, of all these, it is ignorance which is predominant. Patanjali explains that ignorance is the soil in which all the others take root. Swami Dayananda is also convinced that "this ignorance of four kinds, being the means of the bondage of jivas, makes them dance."[23]

Mental Control and *Yoga*—Vedic psychology, after indulging in an analytical study of the mind and its powers, mental modifications, the source of such tendencies and their effect upon life, elaborates upon the means to mental control, through which the living beings can strive for and achieve their true purpose. Concluding this subject in the Yoga Sutras, Patanjali states that when all the three gunas (satva, rajas and tamas) end their activity, i.e., they are deprived of their power of generating impressions, and purusha (jiva or soul) becomes situated in his own true nature, he becomes 'kaivalya': this is the only objective of elucidating this science. Vedic thinkers built up a body of psychological knowledge for the specific purpose of understanding and improving human nature, behaviour and impressions, etc., so that the impres-

sions, which serve as obstacles to the achievement of man's true goal, can be eliminated. Swami Dayananda also sees psychology as useful for the purpose of mental control.

The Meaning of Yoga —"योगश्चित्त वृत्ति निरोध:"[24] Patanjali points out that Yoga means the prevention of mental modifications. The two words 'yoga' and 'nirodha' contained in the aphorism quoted above have been the subject of considerable debate among scholars. Vyas Muni has defined the word 'Yoga' as yogic concentration (yoga samaadhi).[25] In support of this, Vachaspati states that the word is derived from the root 'yuja' which means concentration. In a state of concentration the modifications of the mind are eradicated, because of which commentators on Yoga philosophy define Yoga as the suppression, obstruction or negation of mental tendencies. Vyas' elucidation of the word 'Yoga' in this manner impressed upon scholastic minds, the view that yoga means only negation of mental modifications and that the word as used by Patanjali did not imply bringing about a union with God. Vyas himself did not say anything of the kind, but in his commentary, he also did not explicitly state that yoga implies such a union. In his commentary on "तदा द्रष्टु: स्वरूपेऽवस्थानम्"[26] too, Vyas speaks of the purusha or jiva being established in a state of native purity. This leads to further doubt on the subject and supports the view that yoga cannot lead to the soul's union with God. Apart from these views, some scholars interpret the word 'yoga' to mean conjunction, or the act of bringing together, and thus opine that the purpose of yoga is to bring about a union with God. In their view, Patanjali's definition of yoga, as the negation of mental modifications, implies a suppression of mental modifications.

Swami Dayananda interprets the aphorism "योगश्चित्त वृत्ति निरोध:" to comprehend not merely concentration but also union with God. He states, "Yoga means removing all the evils from the mind, stabilizing the mind in virtues and thus enabling the jiva to achieve proximity with God and liberation"[27] In such a statement, he appears to differ from neither Vyas nor Patanjali. A little deliberation makes it self-evident that negation of mental modifications itself leads the jiva to union with God.

Since God is omnipresent, He must also be present wherever the jiva is present, and hence there is no question of the

jiva uniting with God at a specific place. Soul always exists in God, but because of the mental modification he is unable to realize co-existence. Therefore, mental modification established in chitta obstruct the union with God. It is only the pure soul or jiva who is free from all sorts of mental modifications, attains the realization of God. It is because of this that Patanjali defines yoga as the negation of mental modifications. If, on the other hand, yoga is taken to mean the establishment of the soul in its true nature only, such a statement can have only two meanings. The first is that jiva himself is Brahman and that the jiva, when his ignorance is destroyed, becomes established in his own true nature and thus becomes Brahman. The second is, that Patanjali rejects the possibility of the jiva ever realizing God. But neither of these two contentions is acceptable to Patanjali. He is not a monist, since he accepts the dual existence of purusha or jiva and prakrati or matter, and since he also describes God in his philosophy, he is also certainly not an atheist. Besides, the Shruti also declares "without knowing God it is impossible to escape from death"[28], and Patanjali accepts Shruti as authoritative. Consequently, it is not possible to hold the view that Patanjali rejects the union between soul and God as impossible. This leads one to the conviction that Dayananda's definition of Yoga as "the establishment of the soul in God through negation of mental modifications" is the most appropriate one. This view makes it possible to accept the word "Yoga" as meaning both nagation and conjunction.

Some scholars interpret the term 'nirodha' to mean suppression, and hence they object that yogic philosophy preaches the suppression of mental impressions, not bringing them under control. Consequently, they consider Patanjali's yoga philosophy as the path of 'hatha yoga' or the path of suppression and denial. But any such view shows the failure of these scholars to comprehend the meaning of yoga. Swami Dayananda holds the view that 'nirodha' or negation of mental tendencies means securing victory over them. He says that the individual should eliminate all vices that distract him from the truth and bring his mind to rest in truth. This shows that 'nirodha' does not imply suppression. Even Patanjali himself nowhere speaks of suppressing mental states. For the negation or eradication of mental states,

Patanjali points out an eight-fold path—*yama*, *niyama*, *asana*, *pranayama*, *pratyahara*, *dharna*, *dhyana*. *samadhi* i.e abstention, observance, posture, regulation of breath, withdrawal of senses from their objects, fixed attention, contemplation and concentration respectively. In this, '*yama*' and '*niyama*' are indicative of the purity of thought and deeds, and the fact that Patanjali has put them first, indicates that in his opinion purity of thought and deed is essential for control of the mind. In addition, yoga philosophers stress the importance of practice and dispassion for the negation of mental states On this issue, Vyas explains that these mental states flow in two streams, those that carry towards good and those that carry the jiva towards evil. Of these, the former is of the nature of knowledge and its outcome is *kaivalya* or liberation. In it the constant practice of rational discrimination is employed to open the floodgates of knowledge, while dispassion is brought into play to eradicate the very sources of sensuality. It is only through the simultaneous practice and employment of these two that mental states can be inhibited[29] This indicates with perfect clarity that yoga philosophy preaches the negation of mental states through rational detachment and not through forceful suppression of mental states. Gita also believes that the mind achieves peace through practice and dispassion.[30] In the first aphorism of the second chapter, austerity (*tapa*), study (*swadhyaya*) and surrender to God (*ishwara-pranidhana*) have been pointed out as the three essential practices which constitute yoga of action. Vyas' explanation of 'tapa' is that the person without austerities or tapas can never achieve a state of yoga, because infinite actions and afflictions can never be eliminated without austerities. Vachaspati holds the view that the commentator recommends '*tapa*' or austerity only to the extent that such practices destroy vices but do not harm the body.[31] This penance is accompanied by study (*swadhyaya*) and surrender to God (*ishwara-pranidhana*). The first of these implies the study of texts that help one to proceed towards purity, while the latter implies dedicating all actions and their fruits to the divine being, God.[32] We cannot see that there is any difference between this and the concept of Karmyoga in Gita. Consequently, the term '*nirodha*' cannot possibly mean suppression. It is more logical and rational to

interpret it to mean to negate or eradicate and this appears to be the intention of this philosophy also.

For the achievement of liberation, the mind has to meditate in a particular way, that is, it must remain in constant possession of a powerful urge towards the possession of truth. In general, of course, the mind can be subjected to control in a variety of ways, some of which have been elucidated by Patanjali himself. But the supreme ambition to know the truth and all proper actions indulged in for this purpose open the doors of truth for the seekers of truth and also allow them, depending upon their powers, the liberty to roam freely in it. Prakrati is fully cognisant of those who knock at its closed doors, it is fully conscious of those who have the right to enter its secret fields. For those who possess this right, it immediately throws open its doors. The path indicated by Sankhya thought, the path of discrimination between matter and soul i.e., *prakrati-purusha-viveka* is one such path, and it is referred to as *jyana-marga* or the path of knowledge. Besides, the mind can also be brought under control through breath control or *pranyama*. But in Swami Dayananda's view, the best path to the control of the mind lies in '*ishwara pranidhana*' or devotion to God. He declares that through worship of and meditation upon God the doubts in the mind are removed and human beings quickly achieve samadhi or deep concentration.[33]

The obstacles of Yoga—As Patanjali points out, the path to mental control is riddled with difficulties and obstacles, because the mind and the body acquire their respective natures in consonance with the behaviour that the seeker indulged in before embarking on the path of meditation. But during the period of meditation, when efforts are made to direct life along an entirely new channel, the mind and the body should also acquire a nature in consonance with this new path. The period of abandoning a life of desire and arriving at a divine life may be referred to as the period of transformation. Desires are extremely reluctant to give up their hold and they constantly strive to pull the meditator back towards themselves. In consequence of this conflict between desire and meditation, many kinds of mental and bodily difficulties occur in the body. Like Yoga philosophy, Swami Dayananda also

accepts that such difficulties are of the following nine kinds : *vyadhi*, *stayana*, *sanshaya*, *pramada*, *aalasya*, *avirati*, *bhranti darshana*, *alabdhabhumikatva* and *anavasthitatva* i.e. sickness, languor, doubt, heedlessness. laziness, worldliness, erroneous perception, failure to attain concentration and instability respectively. These obstacles prevent the mind from concentration. In addition, five distortions of the mind—*dukha*, *daurmanasya*, *angamajeyatvam*. *shvasa* and *prashvasa* i. e. pain, despondency, unsteadiness of the body, inhalation and exhalation respectively, also come to birth along with the nine difficulties mentioned earlier, and they also obstruct concentration.[34] Patanjali opines that there is only one way of overcoming these obstacles, and that is the constant practice of one subject.[35] When the mind is fixed constantly on one subject alone, all such difficulties are themselves destroyed. Vyas agrees that the elimination of these difficulties requires constant practice of one subject so that the consciousness may be habituated to concentrating on one thing only. But Vachaspati Misra interprets this one subject to imply God, arguing that God is the sole weapon with which these difficulties can be annihilated, there is no other instrument capable of achieving this. In meditation, God helps the individual, and constantly inspires him to avoid evil paths.

In addition to this, Swami Dayananda elaborates that in order to prepare the body, mind and deeds for worship and meditation, the eight-fold path of Yoga philosophy—*yama*, *niyama*, *asana*, *pranayama*, *pratyahara*, *dharna*, *dhyana*, and *samadhi* i.e. abstention, observance, posture, regulation of breath, withdrawal of senses from their objects, fixed attention, contemplation and concentration respectively are essential. But in Swami Dayananda's philosophy, at the root of these practices lies the worship of God as the main element, and it is because of this that he refers to his view as '*upasana yoga*' or the yoga with devotion.

9
ETHICS

The Soul's Freedom of Action

Question—Is the jiva or soul independent or dependent ?

Answer (Dayananda)—(the jiva is) free in its dutiful actions but dependent within the system of God. The phrase "स्वतन्त्र: कर्त्ता" (*svatantra karta*) or independent agent is a statement found in Panini's grammar, which implies that he who is independent or autonomous is also the agent.

Satyartha Prakash p. 190.

In ethics, the question whether the soul is free to act or not is of supreme importance. Some religious scholars hold the view that all the activities of the world take place in consonance with the will of God, that not even a leaf can flutter without His will. This concept of determinism has impressed itself not only upon the lay-mind, but also upon numerous scholars. Such scholars as Nivasachari propounds that the philosophy of Gita, too, is absolutely deterministic, for he declares that "regard all your actions as determined by Bhagwan or God as the ultimate subject or Karta.[1] But he says that the jiva is free to gain control over his bestial tendencies.

Once it is presumed that all *karmas* or deeds are done by God, any claim that the jiva is free to gain control ower his bestial tendencies amounts to hair-splitting or weaving a web of verbal confusion, because once the assumption of free actions has been made, all deeds, irrespective of whether they take the soul towards divinity or iniquity, remain deeds which must produce inevitable results. And this is what is held by those who contend that the soul is free in its actions. Swami Dayananda was born in a period in which determinism was rife, at a time when it was

widely and firmly held that God's will determined every event in the world, that the soul could not obtain a good worldly life without God's will. He opposed this deistic and fatalistic tendency by propounding the principle of free will, based on the Vedas, Upanishads and other Vedic-philosophical texts, that the jiva is free to act but dependent upon God for the fruits of those deeds. God acts as a perfectly impartial judge in rewarding every soul according to the deeds indulged in by it. In his view, God is not the agent of man's deeds, but the determiner of the fruits of these deeds.

All the pleasure and suffering in the world is the product of the deeds of souls. Such a concept prevents one from attributing prejudice and cruelty to God, because God is not presumed to be doling out pleasure and pain to different souls merely according to His will. All those who deny the principle of freedom of action and subscribe to the view of the world as Gods's plaything cannot help attributing such defects to God. In Dayananda's view, since God is devoid of both attachment and hatred, He neither rewards nor punishes anyone without due cause. God, in the words of the Gita, is the universally unattached mind (*sambuddhi*) from the deeds of souls.[2] If one still maintains obstinately that God is the prime agent, Swami Dayananda answers that such a philosophy is erroneous because "if God had indulged in deeds, soul would have never sinned, because God, being pure and judicious could never have inspired any soul to sin."[3]

Besides, if the theory of freedom of action or free will is rejected, we are left only with the principle of determinism, the propagation of which must inevitably lead to inaction and decline in moral responsibility among human beings. And, Swami Dayananda believes that lack of action and moral responsibility is man's worst evil and greatest enemy. Sankhya believes that salvation is possible only through 'purusharth' or efforts of purush or soul. We find the tapa or austerity is other name of right efforts of purusha. Hence, if belief in determinism leads to the annihilation of efforts of purusha—a fact which can be seen in practice—the human race can never progress. Thus, Dayananda was able to perceive the basic weakness of the human race. He

then ordained that it was necessary to perform action, and thus he succeeded in rejuvenating the ethics of the Upanishads which ordains that man should live for a hundred years, i.e. as long a man lives, he must live a life full of action, he must never sit idle.[4] The Vedas and Upanishads contain numerous do's and don'ts for human beings, the purpose of which is to encourage man to tread the path of progress. Lokmanya Bal Gangadhar Tilak, the scholarly composer of the authoritative 'Gita-Rahasya,' states, if free will is denied then "the mind should be purified in this particular way, this particular deed should be done, this other one must not be done, that is religious, while that other is not etc., all controversies about conduct would themselves be brought to an end."[5] And, in the final result, all the Vedanta-philosophical thinking would become entirely meaningless. Kant was perfectly aware of the importance of free will as an essential question in ethics, and consequently he gave it a place in his three ethical postulates.

Swami Dayananda does declare that the jiva or soul is bound by God, but only in getting the fruits of its deeds, not in their performance. Determinists believe that the soul is bound in both respects. **In Dayananda's philosophy, man is truly the architect of his own destiny.**[6] Fatalists believe that man is dependent upon God. Dayananda believes that salvation is the result of one's effort while fatalists make it dependent upon divine will.

Acceptance of the principle of free will automatically establishes the theory of fruits of one's actions. However, there are certain schools of thought which are not completely comprehended under determinism, and hence instead of calling them deterministic, it would be more appropriate to refer to them as theories of divine will. According to Christianity, God forgives all sins if one brings faith in Jesus Christ. Islam holds that those who have faith in Hazrat Mohammed, will be saved from the eternal fires of hell and Allah will forgive their sins. Swami Dayananda is severely critical of both these views and he argues philosophically that every jiva or soul must necessarily suffer the consequences of its deeds. God does not forgive any body's sinful deed.[7] In Dayananda's words, "If God were to forgive sins, his justice would be destroyed and all human beings would become the greatest sinners because on hearing of the possibility of forgiveness they would obtain the courage and fearlessness to engage in sinful deeds.[8]" Here, Swami

Dayananda not only talks of philosophy, but also hints at one of man's basic weakness, i. e. his tendency to incline towards the satisfaction of his sensuous desires. And, if man is convinced that God will forgive all his sins, if only he has faith in God, then for whom are created ethical laws ? Then whole of the edifice of ethics will collapse and be buried under sensuous skepticism. Under such circumstances, only the words of the mightiest will become ethical laws.

Acharya Gaudpada in his Mandukya-Karika, a commentary on Mandokya Upanishad propagates another kind of determinism, which I will prefer to call karma-uchedavada i. e. the theory of annihilation of actions. Gaudpada expresses the view that there is neither creation nor destruction, neither any soul under bondage nor any seeker after salvation or any liberated being. This he regards as the supreme truth.[9] In this view, since no one is under bondage, then there is no question of any agent or anyone suffering the consequences of his deeds. Hence, there is neither any deed nor its fruit. For those who propagate such a view of transcendentalism (*parmarthavaada*), the entire edifice of ethical thought is rendered baseless and nonsensical. As against this Swami Dayananda's visw is practical, which does not allow one to turn away from the real existence of the world, and hence it assumes the existence of agent, deeds and the fruits of deeds. Swami Dayananda's true majesty lies in the fact that he accepted both practical world and transcendental reality as eternal truths, consequently he succeeded in providing both philosophical and practical answers to all objections raised against the freedom of soul in action.

Metaphysics (*Tatva Shastra*) as the basis of Ethics.

The subject of ethics is the independent deeds of man. It is concerned with an analysis and elucidation of the kinds of actions which should be indulged in. Ontology deals with the basic analysis of God, jiva or soul, prakrati or matter and other similar subjects. But the two disciplines are intimately related. In Indian philosophy, in particular, no effort has been made to dissociate them. The main subject of Gita is ethics which is *Karmyoga*, but it also provides a comprehensive analysis of the existence of God, the immortality of the soul, the existence of matter, etc. The basis of Kant's ethics are his three assumptions—the immortality of the

soul, existence of God and freedom of will—and each one of these three postulates constitutes an important ethical issue. When ethics ordains that a particular deed should be done, then in order to establish the propriety of that deed and to justify its conceptions of good and the highest good, it is compelled to turn to ontology, since it is ontology which determines the existence of God and soul, and the notion of the supreme good. For instance, according to Charvaka philosophy, matter or prakrati is the sole reality, God and the jiva have no existence, consequently, there can be no questions about fruits of actions, re-birth, liberation. etc. As a result, the Charvakas propagate, that "live happily as long as you live, and if need be, take loans to celebrate festivals." In direct contrast to this view, Jain philosophy preaches to its Digamabar seers not only the lesson of abandoning deeds in order to achieve freedom of the soul, but also places the wearing of clothes in the category of collection '*parigraha*', and thus advocates that the seers should abandon the practice of donning clothes and observe perfect non-collection as a means to perfect purity of the soul. However, Jain philosophy conceives of deeds and their fruits without presuming the existence of God as the dispenser of this fruit. But even this has not been established without a sound basis in ontology. Jain philosophy conceives that the actions produce their fruits in the usual course of things. As against this, Swami Dayananda provides a purely philosophical analysis and elucidation of such ethical questions as : what is the supreme good ? What is the ultimate purpose of the soul ? What should it do to achieve this purpose ?

Swami Dayananda refutes the Brahmadvaita concept of moksha which is the highest or supreme good, on ontological ground that in non-dualism or advaita philosophy, the Brahman becomes Jiva because of the adjunct of internal organ (*antahakarnopadhi*), implies that wherever consciousness or anatahakarna travels, the Brahman of that place becomes Jiva, while the Brahman existing at a previous point achieves liberation from its state of Jiva. This further implies that Jiva is achieving liberation every moment, and hence there is no apparent need for any effort to achieve salvation.[10] The aphorism 'ज्ञानान्मुक्ति' means that salvation results only from true knowledge. This aphorism also propounds that he who is desi-

rous of obtaining the highest good of life should possess true knowledge. But what is true and what is not in the visible world can be determined only by the help of metaphysics. If someone obstinately refutes the need to determine metaphysically the nature of reality, then he must be regarded as akin to those persons who continue to travel in life but without knowing where and why they are going, and whether their path is the correct one or not. In his elucidation of the four pre-requisites of the means to salvation, Swami Shankara first of all insists on the discrimination in between true and falsehood of the objects. Swami Dayananda comprehends this aspect under 'Vairagya' or dispassion.[11] And this approach is obviously correct because our concepts about the existence and nature of the world, God and souls i.e. whether such entities exist or not, change our ethical thinking. For example Buddhist philosophy is atheistic and it refutes the existence of a permanent jiva, yet it accepts the truth of rebirth as well as *nirvana* or salvation. It is because of this that such scholars as Radhakrishnan and Tilak begin to doubt, why a philosophy which accepts nirvana and rebirth should be considered atheistic and named annihilationism (*ucchedavad*). The purpose of this argument is to establish the fact that ethics has its foundation in metaphysics, and in this way, Dayananda's consistently metaphysical analysis of ethical problems is entirely appropriate.

Dayananda establishes the following elements through metaphysical proof, and then, like Kant, accepts them as ethical assumptions. The sole difference between them is that while Kant accepted three such assumptions, Dayananda's philosophy visualizes five.

(1) The jiva or soul is immortal and desire, effort and knowledge are its natural attributes.

(2) The soul is free in respect of its actions but dependent in respect of getting their fruits.

(3) The soul can, through its deeds, both move towards progress and emancipation or towards degradation.

(4) The highest objective or purpose of the soul is to obtain liberation. Salvation is the supreme good as well as the realization of God.

(5) God is the dispenser of the fruits of actions.

The ethical assumptions of Kant do not contradict or materially differ from those of Swami Dayananda, instead, Swami Dayananda has gone a step further in clarifying their metaphysical foundations. But this shonld not compel the conclusion that Kantian thought influenced Swami Dayananda's thought. This is not acceptable contention. Swami Dayananda was not even aware of Kant. Besides, Kant's philosophy failed to penetrate the wall of agnosticism *(agveyavada)*, and in consequence he rid himself of facing the problems of the soul, the objective of soul, realization of the supreme being, etc., by declaring them unknowable. In contrast, Swami Dayananda went to the very root of facts and in keeping with the tradition of Vedic seers he referred to realization of God and all existing substances as perfectly knowable. If we can not know the truth, metaphysics loses all its significance and consequently human effort becomes mean and vain. Dayananda firmly believes in the success of human effort, provided it is directed to the right direction. In ethics, it is of supreme importance to believe in human success.

The Supreme Good : Salvation is the Supreme Good

What higher or superior objective of life can an individual have than the annihilation of all his sufferings and the possession of permanent bliss ? Although even hedonistic ethical theories place before mankind the ideal of obtaining pleasure, but their ideal is limited only to physical pleasure of the satisfaction of bodily drives. As against this, permanent or eternal pleasure can be obtained only by forsaking the pleasure that can be obtained from the satisfaction of physical drives. A person who indulges in desires becomes a slave of the senses, dependent upon external objects and a person of narrow tendencies. But the person who is able to achieve liberation and bliss become the master of the senses, i.e. *Indra*, the possesser of unlimited power of determination and a large heart.

Swami Dayananda sees the supreme good of human life only in the attainment of Supreme Bliss which means liberation.

Swami Dayananda explains this in the following discussion: –

"**Question**—From what does the soul seek liberation ?

Answer—(Dayananda) From sufferings.

Question—When liberated from sufferings what does the soul obtain and where does it live ?

Answer—(Dayananda) It obtains contentment and lives in God."[12]

All living beings of the world seek the removal of sufferings, and as the Mahabharata declares, all activities of living beings are directed towards the acquisition of pleasure.[13] In the very introduction to his text on Sankya philosophy, Maharishi Kapil declares that the text is being composed exclusively with a view to securing for the soul, freedom from three kinds of sufferings.[14] Yoga, Nyaya, Jain and Buddhist philosophies, among other schools of thought, declare that the highest moral responsibility of man is to get rid of sufferings and achieve happiness. Even Kant, who talks constantly of duty for duty sake, declares that only that individual can achieve happiness who practises this ideal.[15] And this is the correct view. We cannot turn our back upon this reality of human life that like all other living beings, man runs away from sorrow and misery and seeks for happiness. But this view should not please the hedonists, because the fact of man's natural search for happiness does not imply that man is necessary a hedonist of the Epicurean or Charvaka kind. The Charvakas, who teach only a gross and superficial craving for pleasure, fail to reach the very profound depth of man's desire for happiness and consequently their object becomes the achievement of non-rational sensual pleasure, which is easily obtained. In their view, this pleasure is the highest reward for human efforts. Hedonists ignore the psychological truth that satisfaction of physical desire further strengthens the physical desire and this keeps man constantly engaged in the search for further satisfaction, and ultimately, when the body is deprived of its vitality and strength, man continues to look hungrily and miserably for such satisfaction. Maharaja Bhartrihari points out very correctly that, in reality, the individual who enjoys sensual pleasure in fact does not enjoy such pleasures but is instead consumed by such pleasures.[16] Swami Dayananda is firmly convinced that the experiential approach adopted by hedonists is completely foolish and degraded, an approach which would not attract any intelligent individual.[17]

In addition to this, some thinkers introduce the concept of the greatest happiness of the greatest number in the field of ethics.

They argue that seeking happiness is man's objective, but we should invariably give supremacy to that happiness in which is implicit the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Apparently, of course, this view seems to be somewhat more attractive than the narrow viewpoint of hedonists in that it presents a comparatively broader human goal, but even this is founded in selfishness. Besides, it is obviously more appropriate as a principle of social organization than as an ethical doctrine, although even in that sphere it cannot become a universal law. Because sometimes it is observed that the majority is in favour of something unjust, while the minority may be in the right. In such a situation, how can this principle be upheld ? When considering the supreme good of man, we must consider every aspect of human life without excluding any part of it.

The sane and intelligent individual examines every principle before deciding about its utility, and then seeks to apply it in real life only where it is suitable. Removal of sufferings is the goal of life, but undoubtedly, the longer lasting pleasure is preferrable to a momentary pleasure. If the achievement of eternal happiness necessitates the sacrifice of momentary satisfaction of physical drives, is the sacrifice too great ? Liberal and broad-minded hedonists prefer the longer lasting pleasure to momentary satisfaction and the even longer lasting satisfaction to the pleasure of shorter duration. But, Swami Dayananda speaks instead of a form of happiness that remains for ever, while the hedonists, both the crude ones as well as the liberal and sophisticated ones, concern themselves only with sensual pleasure. Swami Dayananda, on the other hand, speaks of happiness that is beyond the scope of the senses and since it is non-sensual it no longer remains pleasure, but takes on the nature and form of happiness. The Upanishad states that it is that state of happiness which the words cannot apprehend, neither the vision penetrates it nor any other bodily sense can feel it. The Shastras refer to it as '*ananda*' or happiness not as '*sukha*' or pleasure. It is beyond language to describe this happiness because it is realized by the soul in its consciousness.[18] Swami Dayananda explains that in this state, the soul realizes God and mortal becomes immortal. This is the state of '*moksha*' or salvation, a state in which the soul enjoys happiness through its determination rather than through the senses.

Self-realizationists in the western world believe that, in addition to happiness, the supreme good of the life lies in the realization of its various individual and social powers. Urban elaborates his theory of values in terms of the self-realization. He perceives self-realization in proper development and harmony of bodily, social and spiritual values. But these scholars never understood self-realization more than the man's successful behaviour as a social being. The reason is that as long as the nature of the soul and its purpose in this world is not properly understood, it is impossible to understand what self-realization really means. In order to understand the supreme good of life, it is essential to have metaphysical knowledge first, and only then can we understand what the life is meant for. Western advocates of self-realization theory have yet not arrived at this stage of speculation. But Dayananda, like earlier Vedic philosophers, points out that the real objective of life is salvation which is the highest bliss of God. This can be attained only by achieving freedom from the bondage of the attributes of prakrati.

The philosophy of self-realization is often objected to on the ground that it is the view of those who rest satisfied with their own emancipation only. Consequently, the philosophy can be regarded as the sophisticated example of selfishness. It is beyond the scope of our argument here to examine the extent to which this objection applies to European thinkers, but we can say with the deepest conviction that it has not even an iota of truth as far as Swami Dayananda and other Vedic thinkers who preach self-realization are concerned. The reason for this assertion is that in spiritual emancipation there can be no conflict between one individual and another. Neither can such emancipation be divided, and hence there is no fear of its being decreased. Besides, every spiritual individual, on realizing truth, feels naturally inclined towards the good of other's. Moreover, Swami Dayananda says explicitly, "every individual should not be satisfied with his own well-being only, instead he should regard his own well-being as a part of the well-being of other's."[19] In view of this, we are led to the conclusion that the goal of life spelt out by Swami Dayananda is beyond ethical objection, that his goal is in consonance with the Vedas, Upanishads and other systems of thought, that it provides both for the growth of a healthy society and also the achievement

of the supreme truth. In this philosophy, the highest good and the supreme truth are identical, and it is this which is the highest good of man.

The soul cannot achieve freedom from sufferings without true knowledge. Because of the ignorance, the soul mistakenly presumes that the pleasure to be derived from the satisfaction of sensual desires and material objects is the highest goal of life. Hence, it is only the dissolution of ignorance and the possession of true knowledge, which is inclusive of the knowledge of God, which can bring about the freedom from sufferings and thence liberation. The temporariness of bodily pleasures is realized only through knowledge. In this way, Swami Dayananda's views on the highest good of human life are manifestly similar to those of the Upanishads. In his commentary on one Upanishadic mantra, he states, "the jiva achieves salvation only when the knots of ignorance, which bind the soul, are dissolved." He also says that the God who is omnipresent is the consummation of soul and liberated individuals achieve this salvation.

Hedonism—Asceticism—Renunciation of Actions

Hedonists believe that the reason is only an instrument in achieving the sensual pleasure. There is a sect among Hindus, called *Tantravad* or the philosophy of Tantras, which believes that salvation can only be attaind by practising five 'Ms' i.e. *Madya* or consuming alcohol, *Mansa* or eating flesh and *Meen* or fish, *Mudra* or sitting in posture and *Maithuna* or indulgence in sexual intercourse. Some scholars seek to provide a spiritual and psychological basis for the suggested indulgence in these five 'Ms.' Their attempt to explain this philosophy of five 'Ms' is futile. Tantravadins practise these five 'Ms' in the same way as explained above with all horrors. We are unable to understand that how the protagonist of this sect will elucidate those parts of the texts of this school which are explicitly preaching the wrong path (*vam-marga*) ? It is difficult to understand this. There is mention of a similar sect in Kulavarna Tantra according to which the activization of the Bhairavi Chakra leads to the equation of all individuals, in consequence of which every woman—be it sister, daughter or wife—with the exception of mother, is fit for sexual congress. According to them one who indulges excessively in intoxicants

never takes birth again.[20] Swami Dayananda has subjected all such sects to the most virulent criticism in his 'Satyartha Prakash.' Once sensual pleasure is accepted as the goal of life, it becomes almost impossible to escape from the clutches of such devious thinkers, and it becomes impossible to save the social system from total collapse.

At the other extreme of hedonism lies the very difficult path of asceticism or *tapascharya.* This path preaches that one should follow the path of vrtue and be prepared to suffer for the sake of righteousness. To this extent, there seems to be no rigidity in their thought, but they also advocate that since the intellect is superior and the senses are indicative of bestial tendencies, therefore, the senses must be suppressed. Swami Dayananda is opposed to the suppression of the senses. His view is that the body should be maintained in sound health through nutritious food. He was also aware of the fact that it is difficult to suppress the passions, particularly sexual passion.[21] Because of this, he advocates that the individual should live a married life in his youth. He preaches that the individual living a married life should remain satisfied with his own wife and always enhance his knowledge which would lead him to salvation.

However, domestic life does not mean a life devoid of discipline. There is a great gulf between control and suppression. The latter implies the forceful condemnation of some desire, while control means achieving control over it. Suppression is an unintelligent, irrational act, whereas control is entirely rational. A disciplined life possesses the power to discover every secret and mystery of the world. Chakraankita Vaishnavas hold that stamping the body with the heated idol of Lord Vishnu makes it possible to achieve the region of Vishnu. Others hold that pilgrimage to various holy places makes salvation possible, that bathing in the Ganga and other holy rivers brings salvation not only to oneself but even to one's ancestors. A common belief held by a majority of Hindu women is that fasting on some particular auspicious days brings about the fulfillment of all desires. The Mimansakas believe that heaven can be achieved by performing yagnas or religious rituals according to Vedic prescriptions. But Swami Dayananda holds that activities which dry up the body cannot lead to salvation. He favours the holding of

yagnas or burning of a purificatory fire because it certainly pur·fies the atmosphere in the house and thus is an aid to healthy life. But he does not believe that this alone can lead to salvation. Whatever the deeds one indulges in, even those which are intended to obtain heaven, must bring about a concomitant result or fruit and for this purpose rebirth is unavoidable. Consequently, he criticises the Mimansa view because it advocates certain actions which are intentionally directed at certain fruits, and such actions, in his view, can never be productive of salvation. Besides, he also contends that the conviction, that by performing the rituals sins are destroyed, constitutes a covert encouragement to sin, in as much as anyone capable of performing such religious rites will feel free to indulge in sins, since he will be enabled to escape their fruits through rituals. One is now compelled to ask : should one, therefore, abandon actions ? But this is inconceivable because no living human being can abstain, even for a moment, from action. To say nothing of weightier deeds, even the rising and falling of the eyelids constitutes a deed. Besides, there are numerous involuntary actions, for instance, the closing of the eyelids whenever there is fear of injury to the eye. This reflex action cannot possibly be prevented. In the same way, all the deeds of human beings, be they normal daily activities or specified actions, are motivated by necessity, or, in other words, the expectation of some good result. Dayananda accepts the reality of this psychological truth implicit in all actions, and keeping in mind the aphorism of Manu, he declares, that, in a man who is completely without desire, even the dilation and contraction of eyes is not possible, which proves that whichever action or effort one indulges in is inspired with the desire.[22] Further, it is also impossible to renounce all activity. Actions are inevitable, therefore, one can not renounce them, In view of this, Dayananda preaches to humanity in general that as long as a man lives, be it one hundred years, he should have the desire to indulge in deeds, he should never sit in idleness. But when indulging in deeds, he should sacrifice the desire for the fruits of his actions.

Synthesis of Knowledge and Action

The Gita contains an elaborate account of two major paths to salvation—path of knowledge or *Jyana Marga* and path of action

Karma Marga. Both these paths lead to the same goal, irrespective of, which one is adopted. The advocates of jyana-marga like Shankara hold the view that one cannot attain salvation without renouncing the actions and the path of action is preparatory to the path of knowledge. But it is impossible for a person with domestic responsibilities to renounce the action and sit inactive in some isolated forest spot and indulge in profound meditation so as to walk the path of knowledge. Consequently, Gita considers the path of action or karma-marga as superior. But this does not mean that Gita minimizes the importance of knowledge in the pursuit of salvation. Lord Krishna himself indulged in profound metaphysical speculation in his elaboration of the importance of karma-yoga. He pointed out that the soul is immortal, the attributes of prakrati or matter possess the power to bind u , the bond.ge of deeds can be destroyed when one becomes beyond the impact of three gunas (*trigunateeta*) and performs actions without any desire for fruit. The very concept of karmayoga cannot be elucidated without knowledge. An ignorant individual can never really grasp its utility, and since this is so, he can hardly be expected to shape his conduct accordingly. Swami Dayananda considers both knowledge and action as important.[23] The Upanishads, Sankhya and other philosophical systems also hold that salvation is impossible without knowledge.[24] This view has been accepted even by the Buddhist and Jain sects. Here the word 'knowledge' implies proper or adequate knowledge of elements, in addition to adequate knowledge of creation and the substances or materials of creation[25]. Possession of this metaphysical knowledge enables the jiva or soul to comprehend the reality of pleasure, pain and other mutations of matter, and thus to realize that they are both impermanent and insignificant. In this state, his deeds are not guided by selfishness and hence they lack the power to bind, instead, they are deeds guided by a sense of responsibility and social good. Undoubtedly, even these deeds aim at some objective but a true yogi remains always unconcerned with the result. And this is what constitutes *karmayoga*. This path is accessible only to the individual who has won completely ascendency over selfishness and has become 'jitendriya', which, in Swami Dayananda's philosophy, means an individual who has achieved perfect mastery over the senses as well as the mind. Without control of the mind,

the senses can never be subjected to control. Dayananda declares, "He is called 'jitendriya' who does not feel pleasure when praised and sorrow when abused, pleased when he experiences joy and depressed on experiencing misery, pleased on seeing beauty and angry on observing ugliness, pleased with delicious food and pained with insipid food, attracted by fragrance and driven away by foul smells."[26] There is no difference between Swami Dayananda's 'jitendriya' individual and Gita's 'samabuddhi' individual. According to the Vedas, he alone is the possessor of both knowledge and ignorance who is rationally aware of the secrets of deeds and who rationally chooses his actions and conduct. Swamiji declares that "the individual who is simultaneously aware of the nature of knowledge as well as ignorance overcomes the death by following the path of action and achieves salvation through knowledge.[27]

MORAL VIRTUES

Only that ethical theory can be considered a successful ethical theory which provides an elaboration of and insight into the worldly as well as spiritual life of man. As against Shankara's theory of 'maya' (the world is an illusion), Swami Dayananda accepts the reality of the world in his philosophy, and similarly, in his ethical theories, he accepts the world as it is. His objective was two-fold—that man should progress in the material sphere as well as in the spiritual. These two have been referred to as '*abhyudaya*' and '*nishreyasa*'. Vaisheshika philosophy ordains that the rightful attainment of both of these amounts to 'dharma'[28], a definition which Swami Dayananda accepts whole heartedly He holds the view that the actions which provide both the desired worldly pleasure as well as transcendental bliss in salvation, should be regarded as 'dharma', while all other actions contrary to this are adharma.[29]

Four features of Dharama—However, the foregoing description of 'dharma' is inadequate, and ethics cannot be said to have achieved its purpose if it goes no further, because an ethical theory must outline the actions which can lead to '*abhyudaya*' and '*nishreyasa*', the achievement of material as well as spiritual happiness. Agreeing with Manu Smriti, Swami Dayananda points to the four characteristics of dharama—first the Vedas;

second, smriti, i.e. the smritis which are fully conversant with the Vedas like Manu Smriti; third, the conduct of true persons who indulge in actions ordained by the Vedas; and fourth, that which is preferred by one's own soul, i.e., indulging in such actions as truth telling, which the soul desires. These are the four characteristics of Dharam.[30] In Swami Dayananda's view, the four Vedas are divine creations. they are texts revealed by God and hence they contain knowledge about the most superior forms of conduct, and hence, the forms of conduct laid therein constitute the highest ethical theory. In order to discover the laws of ethical behaviour contained in the Vedas, we should not follow the Vedic commentaries composed by Mahidhara, Ubbatta or Max Mueller. These ethical laws are to be discovered only in Swami Dayananda's elaborations of Vedic mantras, since it was he who followed faithfully the methodology of the ancient Vedic seers. For Swami Dayananda, whole of Manusmriti is not authoritative because many of its couplets are interpolated, therefore, the couplets or shlokas which agree with the Vedas relating moral conduct are authority on ethical conduct. Besides this, the characteristics of good conduct are first imitating the conduct of ture persons with respect to dharam, and secondly, guiding one's conduct according to the dictates of one's soul. Man's soul forever hesitates in indulging in false behaviour.[31] If man sacrifices selfishness and conducts himself as his soul guides, he can almost never walk the path of falsehood and deceit. In a similar manner, Kant also asks us to take refuge in pure reason, because, according to his philosophy, the pure reason is intellect devoid of selfishness, and it is this which provides the foundation of his ethical theory. But Swami Dayananda has pointed out three other characteristics of right conduct, so that, despite having recourse to pure reason, if ever one should be in doubt, one may be able to discover the right course.

The Eleven Moral Virtues—Although Swami Dayananda's theory of action gives the highest place to true conduct, Swami Dayananda points out eleven characteristics of right conduct by adding ahimsa or non-violence to the ten dictated by Manu.

(1) *Ahimsa* or non-violence—one should never indulge in hatred or in any desire to cause harm to any hody.

(2) *Dhrati* or steadfastness—never abandoning righteousness or dharam, but following it with the greatest patience, irrespective of pleasure or suffering, loss or gain.

(3) *Kshama* or forgiveness—tolerating criticism, abuse, worship, insult, etc., and yet following righteousness or dharam.

(4) *Dama* or application—turning the mind away from unrighteous activity and keeping it inclined towards righteousness alone.

(5) *Asteyama* or avoidance of theft—never acquiring the money or property of others through injustice and unfair means by words, actions or thought.

(6) *Shauchama* or cleanliness—purifying the mind and soul through renunciation of aversion, attachment etc., and the body through water etc.

(7) *Indriyanigraha* or control of sensiblity—turning the external sense organs away from unrighteous activity and inclining them towards right actions.

(8) *Dhi* or wisdom—constantly increasing intellectual power through true knowledge, such as study of the Vedas, control over desires, keeping good company and strictly avoiding bad company bad habits, use of intoxicants, etc.

(9) *Vidya* or learning—obtaining that knowledge which provides realistic knowledge of all substances, starting from earth to God.

(10) *Satyama* or truth—Accepting the truth, speaking the truth and acting truthfully.

(11) *Akrodha* or restraint of anger—Abandoning such qualities as anger and adopting such qualities as peace and patience is called righteousness or dharam.[32]

Truth is the Cardinal Virtue—Any conduct which is opposed to the principles outlined above is adharam and it takes the soul towards misery and bondage. But even among the eleven virtues pointed out above, Swami Dayananda regards *True Conduct* as the *Cardinal Virtue*. The super most duty of everyone is to follow the truth in thought, word and deed. The Mundakopanishad states

that "the soul can realize the Paramatma or God through observance of truth, austerity and brahamcharya (control of desires)."[33] "Truth alone brings victory, not falsehood."[34] Swamiji declares that the word 'rit' also refers to truth, and that "there is no characteristic of dharam or righteousness superior to truth in speech and conduct."[35] In true persons, it is truth which enlightens them.

The ten virtues, described by Manu, are beyond space and time, caste or creed. In every race, in every religion, in every country, conduct according to these laws is beyond doubt and criticism. Swami Dayananda has added 'ahimsa' or non-violence to Manu's list of virtues, and while it is conceivable that Manu's concept of forgiveness may have comperhended non-violence, Swamiji was convinced that it was absolutely necessary for a true person to abandon enmity or jealousy, and that is why he added the virtue of non-violence to Manu's concept.

Swami Dayananda laid greater stress on brahmacharya as an essential pre-requisite for a successful life than any preceding thinker. He conceives of brahmacharya as preventing the loss of seminal energy through thought, word and deed. Without such continence, the powers of the body and mind become enfeebled, then how a feeble man can follow the path of salvation, the highest objective of life. Swami Dayananda was perfectly aware of human nature and psychology, and consequently he realized that in youth it is extremely difficult "to control the force of sexual desire and to restrain the senses"[36] Therefore, he ordains that one should live a married life in his youth. But he also suggests that self-control must be exercised in family life. Sexual congress should be indulged in only in ovulation period (ritu-kala). The individual "who is satisfied with his wife and has sex only in the ovulation period (ritu-kala), that married person is similar to a celibate."[37] Both men and women should maintain the highest purity in their sexual relations.

The form of the ethical ideal that Swami Dayananda places before us is a flawless system and hence it is acceptable. By referring to the Vedas as the source of all virtue, Swami Dayananda means that the Vedas contain knowledge about right conduct. Sri Aurobindo expresses the view that the Vedas contain a detailed

description of the conflict that marks human life and the path by which this conflict can be avoided. Despite such a view, Swami Dayananda holds that a good person, whose conduct is right, deserves all praises, irrespective of the religion he believes in. No one can possibly object to Dayananda's concept of righteousness or dharam as truth, since it embodies a universal religion.

CASUISTRY

Even while observing ethical laws and principles in one's daily life, one is often confronted by situations in which it becomes difficult to decide upon a course of action because of a conflict between two opposing duties. For instance, when the country faces external aggression, should one eschew violence and thereby allow peaceloving and helpless individuals to be crushed by the enemy, or should one forget non-violence, take up arms and face the enemy valiantly? The following statement of the Gita, "even learned and wise persons are sometimes plunged in doubt about what is worth doing and what is not,"[38] hints at this problem of ethics. On such occasions even the wisest of man sometimes can not decide upon what should be done. Yoga philosophy declares truth, non-violence, non-stealing, non-collection and continence to be the five universal and supreme virtues, and there can not be any doubt about the validity of them. Even they who violate these principles, emphasize their importance in day-to-day life. For instance, even the lawyer who does not hesitate to resort to falsehood, would never like his son or his client to lie before him. The same applies to the other virtues. But in the case of each one of them, there are occasions when obedience to them brings about an exception. Suppose, some innocent persons who are being pursued by evil persons come and take shelter in your house. If, a few moments later, the evil pursuers arrive and ask you about the hiding place of the innocent persons, would you consider it your duty to reveal the truth and thus allow the evil persons to kill the innocent ones or to misguide than by speaking a falsehood and thus save the latter? Such situations can easily arise with reference to non-violence. Mahatma Gandhi was the greatest worshipper of non-violence in the present age But when Kashmir was attacked, he himself advised that the armed forces should be sent into Kashmir to protect it against the invaders. Swami Daya-

nanda also declares these five virtues to be of the first importance in human life, but he favours the use of force and valour as a part of one's duty towards the state when the country is attacked by some other nation.

Thus, we can see that even our great seers accept the fact that there can be exceptions to the observance of these five virtues, but they do not allow selfishness or gross sensuality to take shelter behind such exceptions. Swami Dayananda was a practical social reformer and an ethical philosopher. He was constantly faced with two questions. The first was that our ethical philosophy should be such that by treading the path outlined in it, an individual should be able to achieve his highest goal. The second was that individual acts should not hinder the social good. Casuistry falls within the domain of the second question. But the sole objective of all forms of social behaviour is a successful spiritual life, and hence he advises that even when dealing with exceptional cases, our conduct should be such that our conscience is not polluted. If the father raises his hand against his son, it is for the latter's good. It is not because the father's heart is tinged with malice against the son. In the same way, even in exceptional cases, the doer's heart should not be motivated by malice or selfishness. Swami Dayananda, therefore, concludes that purity of the mind and absence of malice are essential in dealing with exceptional cases.

On this subject, Swami Dayananda has given us a principle which can be said to be as universal and beyond doubt as the laws of morality laid down by Kant. He says that "we should conduct ourselves towards everyone else with goodwill, righteousness and accordingly.[39] Of the three important elements implicit in this rule, the first is that we should abandon our jealousy and behave towards others with affection. Secondly, our conduct should be guided by moral virtues and other eithical principles. Thirdly, our behaviour should be in consonance with the other individual's position and actions, which implies that we should conduct ourselves with propriety. It becomes clear from this that, in Swami Dayananda's view, the principle of propriety applies to all exceptions to ethical principles, but that propriety is to be determined by an intellect which is devoid of selfishness, jealousy and malice but possessed of righteousness and goodwill. He favours genero-

sity even towards the defeated enemy because he believes that every individual indulges in sin or virtue according to his sinful or virtuous deeds of the past. Consequently, one should hate the sin in the sinner, not the individual himself. Hence, he argues that one should not hurt the feelings of the defeated enemy.[40] But he also believes that one must always be alert and proposeful in the suppression of evil persons. Thus, according to this rule, one does not violate ethical principles and also arrives at a solution of one's difficulty in choosing the right path of conduct.

————

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

A. Up.	Aitreya Upanishad.
Br. Su.	Braham–Sutra.
Br. Up.	Brahadaranyak-Upanishad.
Ch. Up.	Chandogya-Upanishad.
I. Up.	Ishopnishad.
K. Up.	Kathopnishad.
Ken Up.	Kenopnishad.
M. Up.	Mundakopnishad.
Mandu. Up.	Mandukyopnishad.
N. Su.	Nyaya–Sutra
P. Up.	Prashnopnishad
R. B. B.	Rigvedadi-Bhasya-Bhumika, –By Dayananda, Vedic Yantralaya Ed. Samvat 1985 V. VI Reprint.
S. P.	Satyartha-Prakash, By Dayananda. Sarvdeshika Press Ed. II Reprint. Samvat 2011
S. Su.	Sankhya–Sutra
Shvet. Up.	Shvetashvetropnishad.
T. Up.	Tetriopnishad.
V. Su.	Vaisheshika–Sutra.
Y. Su.	Yoga–Sutra.

R E F E R E N C E S .

CHAPTER 1

1. प्रत्यक्षेणानुमित्या वा यस्तूपायो न विद्यते । एतं विदन्ति वेदेन तस्माद् वेदस्य वेदता·········अतः कर्माणि वेदस्य विषयः । तदवबोधः प्रयोजनम् ।"

   From the preface of the commentary on Kandva Samhita, by Sayanacharya.
2. "The ancient Scripture was delivered over to a scholarship laborious, bold in speculation, ingenious in its flights of fancy, conscientious according to its own lights, but ill fitted to understand the method of the old mystic poets; for it was void of any sympathy with that ancient termperament, unprovided with any clue in its own intellectual or spiritual environment to the ideas hidden in the Vedic figures and parables." **The Secret of the Veda, by Sri Aurbindo, p. 22. Vol. 10. Sri Aurbindo Birth Centenary library-Popular** Edition.
3. **Ibid. p. 22.**
4. "The modern theory of the Veda starts with the conception, for which Sayana is responsible, of the Vedas as the hymnal of an early, primitive and largely barbaric society crude in its moral and religious conceptions, rude in its social structure and entirely childlike in its outlook upon the world that environed it." **Ibid. p. 23.**
5. "This was the final outcome of religious thought...... ending with a belief in one power, the unknown rather the unseen God, worshipped though ignorantly worshipped through many years by the poets of Vedic age." **The Vedant Philosophy, p. 22, by Max Muller, III reprint, Calcutta.**
6. *'Vedic Mythology,: by A. A. Macdonell.*
7. *Satpath Brahman, 11-5-2-3.*

8. *Shvetashvetropnishad, 6-18.*
Manu-Smriti. 1-23
Vaisheshika-Sutra. 1-1-3
Yoga-Sutra. 1-26
Vedanta-Sutra. 1-1-3
Sankhya-Sutra. 5-51
9. 'वे (ऋषिगण) तो मन्त्रों के अर्थ प्रकाशक थे' । S. P. p. 205
10. "The Rishi was not the individual composer of the hymn, but seer (*drasta*) of an eternal truth and an impersonal knowledge." **The Secret of the Veda, p. 8 by Sri Aurbindo.**
11. **Regvedadi-Bhasya-Bhumika, p. 13.** Dayananda
12. 'Such one is the case of a human child Ramu brought up by a she wolf. The boy was caught by the hunter and brought to hospital. There he could not renounce his animal like behaviour even after best efforts.' **Writer.**
13. *R. B. B. Dayananda p. 13*
14. *Ibid. p. 45*
15. *Ibid. p. 45*
16. *Ibid. p. 48*
17. *Ibid. p. 46*
18. *Bankim-Tilak-Dayananda, By Sri Aurbindo, p. 57. III Ed.*
19. 'In this commentary on the Vedas, nothing unauthentic has been used. But this commentary is being created according to the technique used by the ancient rishis starting from Brahma to Vyasa'. **R. B. B. p. 2 (Hindi)**
20. 'Dayananda has given the clue to the linguistic secret of the Rishis and re-emphasised one central idea of the Vedic religion, the idea of the One Being.......' **The Secret of the Veda, p. 31, Sri Aurbindo.**
21. *R. B. B. p. 46. By Dayananda.*
22. 'अत: परमोऽर्थो वेदानां ब्रह्मैवास्ति' । *Ibid p. 46*
23. Q. There are more gods than one mentioned in Vedas. Do you believe this or not ?

    A. (D)—No, we do not, as no where in all the four

Vedas is written any thing that could go to shcw that there are more gods than one. On the other hand, it is clearly said in many places that there is only one God.'' *S. P. 203· translated by Dr. Chiranjive Bhardwaja.*

24. ''योन्यां देवतामुपास्ते न स वेद यथा पशुरेवं स देवानाम्'' **Shatpath. Br.** 14-4-2-19,22. *Referred by Dayananda in his R. B. B. on page 71.*
25. *A Vedic Reader for Students, p. 92, A. A. Macdonell, Reprint 1954.*
26. It was necessary, therefore, for the purpose of accurate reasoning to have a name different from polytheism, to signify this worship of single gods, each occupying for a time a supreme position, and I propose for it the name of Kathenotheism, that is a worship of one God after another or Henotheism, the worship of single God'. *India What Can It Teach Us ? by Max Muller. p. 146-147, 1892.*
27. ''They are greatly mistaken who take the word devata to mean God.'' *S. P. 203. English Translation*
28. *Nirukta, 7-15*
29. ''व्यवहार के देवताओं की उपासना कभी नहीं करनी चाहिये, किन्तु एक परमेश्वर की ही करनी चाहिये।''*R. B. B. p. 69. Dayananda.*
30. ''योन्यां देवतामुपास्ते न स वेद यथा पशुरेवं स देवानाम् ''। *Shatpath-Br. 14-4-2-19,20*
31. *S. P. p. 5*
32. *Ibid. p. 5*
33. *Ibid. p. 5*
34. *Yajur-Veda, 40-1*
35. *Ibid. 32-1*
36. *Rig-Veda, 1-6-15-5, 1-164-46, 8-7-17-2*
    Sam-Veda, uttararchikah, 1-4-11
    Atharva-Veda, 13-4-3, 4, 5 and 13-4-19, 20, 21
37. *The Religion of the Rigveda, p. 109-110, by Griswold.*
38. *Bankim-Tilak-Dayananda, p. 55-56, Sri Aurbindo.*
39. ''पतिर्बभूथासमो जनानामेको विश्वस्य भुवनस्य राजा'' । *Rigveda 6-36-4*

40. "सूत्रं सूत्रस्य यो विद्यात्स ब्राह्मणं महत्" । *Atharva-Veda. 10-4-8-37*
"यत्र लोकांश्च कोशांश्चापो ब्रह्मजना विदुः । यसच्च यत्र सच्चान्तः स्कम्भं तं ब्रूहि कतमः स्विदेव सः ।" *Atharva-Veda 10-4-7-10*
"ब्रह्माणं ब्रह्मवाहसं गीर्भिः सखाय मृग्मियम् । गां न दोहसे हुवे ।" *Rigveda 6-45-7*
"रूचं ब्राह्मं जनयन्तो देवा अग्रे तदब्रुवन् । यस्त्वैवं ब्राह्मणो विद्यात्तस्य देवा असन्वशे ।" *Yajur-Veda 31-21*
"ओ३म् खं ब्रह्म ।" *Yajur-Veda 40-17*
41. "The conception of Braham which has been the highest glory for the vedant philosophy of latter days had hardly emerged in the Rigveda from the association of the sacrificial mind." *A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. I., p. 20, by S. N. Das Gupta, Printed 1922.*
42. "एवमेव सर्वेषां वेदानामीश्वरे मुख्येऽर्थे मुख्यतात्पर्यमस्ति । तत्प्राप्ति प्रयोजना एव सर्व उपदेशाः सन्ति ।" *R. B. B. p.* 47, *Dayananda.*
43. *R. B. B. p. 46, Dayananda.*
44. "सर्वे वेदा यत्पद्मामनन्ति·····ओमित्येतत् ।" *Kathopnishad* 1.2.15.
45 "तत्तुसमन्वयात्" । *Vedant-Sutra* 1-1-4.
46. "त्वं हि विश्वतो मुख विश्वतः परिभूरसि" । *Rigveda*, 1-97-6.
47. 'पादोऽस्य विश्वाभूतानि त्रिपादस्यामृतं दिवि ।' *Yajurveda*, 31-3.
48. "त्रिपादूर्ध्व उदैत्पुरुषः पादोऽस्येहाभवत्पुनः । ततोविष्वङ् व्यक्रामत्साशनानशनेऽअभि ।' *Yajurveda*, 31-4.
49. *Atharva-Veda*, 2-2-2.
50. 'तमेव विदित्वाऽतिमृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय ।' *Yajur Veda* 31-18.
51. *Yajurveda*, 17-18.
52. 'विश्वतश्चक्षुरुत विश्वतोमुखो विश्वतोबाहुरुत विश्वतस्पात् ।' *Yajurveda*, 17-19
53: 'हिरण्यगर्भः समवर्त्तताग्रे भूतस्य जातः पतिरेक आसीत् ।' *Rigveda*, 10-121-1. **See S. P. p. 208 also.**
54. 'पादोऽस्य विश्वाभूतानि त्रिपादस्य अमृतं दिवि ।' *Yajurveda*, 31-3.
55. *Yajurveda*, 31-4.
56. "Pantheism is the doctrine that God is all and all is God." *Introduction to Philosophy, p.* 387. *Patrick* (*Revised Edition*)

57. *Rigveda*, 8-95-7, 1-164-20, 1-164-39.

58. 'द्वा सुपर्णा सयुजा सखाया समानं वृक्षं परिषस्व जाते ।
तयोरन्य: पिप्पलं स्वाद्वत्त्यनश्नन्नन्यो अभिचाकशीति ॥

Rigveda, 1-164-20

59. 'In X. 121 we have an account of the creation of the world by an omnipotent God out of pre-existing matter.' *I-P. Vol. 1 p. 100, Dr. S. Radhakrishnan. (1951)*

60. *Rigveda, 10-129-1*. These seven verses belong to Nasadiya Sukta.

61. *Rigveda, 10-129-2.*

62. *Rigveda, 10-129-3.*

63. *Rigveda, 10-129-4.*

64. *Rigveda,* **10**-*129-5.*

65. *Rigveda,* **10**-*129-6.*

66. *Rigveda,* **10**-*129-7.*

67. 'किन्तु परब्रह्मण: सामर्थ्याख्यमतीव सूक्ष्मं सर्वस्यास्य परमकारणसंज्ञमेव तदानीं समवर्त्तत ।' **R. B. B. p. 122**

68. (i) 'Darkness and space enveloped the undifferentiated water'. **Vedic Mythology by A. A. Macdonell**

(ii) 'Darkness there was in the beginning all this was a sea without a light'. **Rigveda X. 129, Max Muller**

69. 'स ईक्षत लोकान्नु सृजा इति' । **Atreya Upanishad 1-1-1.**

70. 'प्रलयावसरे······वा निश्चयार्थे, स परमं सुखमपि नाप्नोति' ।

R. B. B. p. 123.

71. *Ibid. p. 123.*

72. ''सप्तास्यासन् परिधयस्त्रि: सप्त समिध: कृता:' । Yajurveda, 31-15
M. Dayananda referred the verse and commented upon it in his R. B. B. p. 135-136.

73. 'They had no special doctrine about life after death...... Rebirth is still at a distance.'

I. P. Vol. I p. 113-114, Dr.*S.* Radhakrishnan. (1951)

74. 'असुनीते पुनरस्मासु चक्षु: पुन: प्राणमिह नो धेहि भोगम् ।'
'Rigveda 8-1-23-1. For commentary see R. B. B. p. 218-219

75. *Yajurveda*, 4-15

76. *Atharv-Veda*, 7-67-1
77 *R. B. B. p.* 221
78. 'द्वे सृती अश्रवणं पितृणामहं देवानामुत मर्त्यानाम् ।' *Yajur veda*, 19-47
Dayananda interprets it in the following way.
'अस्मिन् संसारे······द्वौ मार्गौ स्तः। एक पितृणां ज्ञानिनां, देवानां विदुषां च द्वितीय······तयोरेकः पितृयानो, द्वितीय देवयानश्चेति' ।
R. B. B. 222
79. 'कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि······ ।' *Yajurveda*, 40-2

80, 'वैदिक धर्म एवं दर्शन ।'
Vol. II, p. 722, *By A. B. Keith, transla ted by Suryakant.*
81. 'स्तुता मया वरदा वेद माता प्रचोदयन्तां पावमानी द्विजानाम। आयुः प्राणं प्रजाँ पशुं कीर्तिं द्रविणं ब्रह्मवर्चसम् । मह्यं दत्वा व्रजत ब्रह्मलोकम्' ।
Atharv-Veda 19-71-1.
82. *R. B. B. p.* 45 & 49
83. *The Secret of the Veda,p.* 74 *Sri. Aurbindo.*
83. *S. P. p.* 236
84. 'वेदाहमेतं······नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय ।'
Yajurveda, 31-18 *For Dayananda's commentary see R.B. B. p.* 139-140
85. तद्विष्णोः परमं पदं सदा पश्यन्ति सूरयः' । *R igveda*, 1-2-7-5.

86. 'को नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात् पितरं च दृशेयं मातरं च।'
Rigveda 1-24-*1*
87.अग्नेर्वयं...। स नो मह्या अदितये पुनर्दात् पितरं च दृशेयं मातरं च ।Rig. 1-24-2 *For explanation on both the mantras, see S. P., p.* 244-245

CHAPTER 2

1. 'न ब्राह्मणानां वेद संज्ञा भवितुमर्हति ।'*R. B. B.p.85 Dayananda*
2. 'मैं वेदों में एक ईशावास्य को छोड़ के अन्य उपनिषदों को नहीं मानता किन्तु अन्य सब उपनिषद् ब्राह्मण ग्रन्थों में हैं। वे ईश्वरोक्त नहीं है।'

Bhramochedan in Dayananda-Laghu-Granth-Sangrah. *p.* 213, *Ed.* 1980.

3. *Ibid.* 214.
4. 'In these Upanishads the whole ritual and sacrificial system of the Veda is not only ignored, but directly rejected as useless, nay, as mischievous.'
The Vedant Phil. By Max Muller, p. 16, *Cal.* 1955.
5. 'तत्रापरा ऋग्वेदो यजुर्वेदः सामवेदोऽथर्ववेदः······ ।' *M Up.p* 1-1-5.
6. 'पल्वा ह्येते अदृढा यज्ञरूपा············ ।' *M. Up.* 1–2-7
7. ' पल्वा ह्येते अदृढा यज्ञरूपा अष्टादशोक्तमवरं येषु कर्म ।
एतच्छ्रेयो येऽभिनन्दन्ति मूढा जरामृत्युं ते पुनरेवापि यन्ति ।।
M. Up. 1-2-7.
8. 'कुर्वन्नेवेह कर्माणि············ । ········· कर्म न लिप्यते नरे' ।।
I. U. 2.
9. *S. P., p.* 124, *Also see M. Up.* 1-2-8
10. 'यस्तन्न वेद किमृचा करिष्यति' । *Rigveda,* 1-164-39.
11. 'तमेव विदित्वाऽति मृत्युमेति नान्यः पन्था विद्यतेऽयनाय' ।
Yajurveda, 31-18..
12. 'वाग विवृताश्च वेदाः ।' *M. Up.* 2–1–4
13 'तस्मादृचः सामयजूंषि दीक्षा यज्ञाश्च सर्वे क्रतवो दक्षिणाश्च ।'
M. Up. 2-1-6.
14. See Bhramochedan, by Dayananda in *Dayananda-Laghu-Granth-Sangrah p.* 218 *Ed.* 1980.
15. '**B**ut this conception, supported by misleading European parallels, really explains nothing. Such profound and ultimate thoughts such systems of subtle and elaborate psychology as are found in the substance of Upanishads do not spring out of a previous void.' **The Secret of the Ved, p.3 Sri Aurbindo.**
16. 'सर्वे वेदा यत् पदमामनन्ति ···तत्ते पदं **संग्रहेण** ब्रवीम्योमित्येतत्' ।
K. Up. 1-*2-15*
17. 'अत्र चत्वारो वेदविषयाः सन्ति । विज्ञान कर्मोपासना ज्ञानकाण्ड भेदात् । अत्रैव सर्वेषां वेदानां तात्पर्यमस्तीश्वरस्य खलु सर्वेभ्यः पदार्थेभ्यः प्रधानत्वात् ।' R.B.B. **p**.44.Dayananda.
18. (i) See Upanishado men Audarya' ,**article contributed by Dr. P. K. Acharya to Kalyan. Jan. 1949. p** 87.

(ii) 'The chief reason why the Upanishads are called the end of the Vedas is that they present the central aim and meaning of the teaching of the Vedas.' **The Principal Upanishads, p.24. London 1953. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan.**

(iii) 'सन्ति खलु उपनिषदो वेदमूला इति सर्वेषामेव निर्विवादमभिमतम्'। संस्कृत साहित्य विमर्श, पृष्ठ १४८ ले० द्विजेन्द्र नाथ शास्त्री ।

19. '*Vedant Philosophy, p.20&24 Max Muller* .
20. *Mandukyopnishad,* 2.
21. (i) *S.P. p.* 165

    (ii) 'They sought to recover the lost or waning knowledge by meditation and spiritual experience ......the Vedic word was a seed of thought and vision by which they recovered old truths in new forms.' **The Secret of the Veda. p. 12 Sri Aurbindo.**
22. 'नायमात्मा प्रवचनेन लभ्यो न मेधया न बहुना श्रुतेन ।' **K. Up. 2-23**
23. 'यतो वाचो निवर्त्तन्ते । अप्राप्य मनसा सह' । **T. Up. B.Valli, Anuvak-4.**
24. 'To us Upanishads have......................On the contrary we expect to find variety and are even pleased when we find independent thought and apparant contradictions between individual teachers'. **The Vedant Philosophy, p. 24, Max Muller, Ist Ed., (3rd) reprint** .
25. 'इन्द्रोमायाभिः पुरुरूप इयते' ।*Br. Up.,*2-5-19
26. *Ch. Up.* 6—1—4
27. *Shvet. Up.* 1-9
28. *Ibid.* 4-10
29. 'श्रुतिरपि प्रधान कार्यत्वस्य' । Sankhya-Sutra 5--12
30. 'नित्योनित्यानाम् चेतनश्चेतनानामेको बहुनां यो विदधाति कामान्' । Shvet. Up. 6-13
31. 'The realistic tendencies of the Upanishads receive emphasis in the Sankhya conception of the universe'. I P.Vol. 2 p.250 S. Radhakrishnan.
32. *See Shankar's commentary on Ch. Up.* 6–2–1
33. 'सदेव सोम्येमग्र आसीदेकमेवाद्वितीयम्' । Ch.Up. 6–2–1. Also see S.P. p. 198 for Dayananda's explanation on it.
34. **Dayananda-Granth-Mala, Vol.II. p. 902 Shatabdi Ed.**

35. *K. Up.* 2–1–11
36. (i) *S. P. p.* 211–212

    (ii) **Dayananda–Laghu-Granth-Sangrah' p.** 32 Edited by Arsha Sahitya Prachar Trust, Delhi . Ed.**II** 1980
37. *Dayananda-Granth-Mala. Vol. II p.* 902
38. *M. Up.* 3--1--1
39. *S. P. p.* **209**
40. *M. Up.* 3-1-2
41. *Sanskrit-Sahitya-Vimarsha, p.* 150 *Dvijendra Nath.*
42. 'This idea that the world is only Maya and illusion **a** vision, a nothing was what Colebrooke meant when he said it was absent from the Upanishads and the original Vedant philosophy and so far he is right.' **The Vedant Phil. p. 70, Max Muller**
43. 'यतो वा इमानि भूतानि जायन्ते येन जातानि जिवन्ति ...तद् ब्रह्मेति'। T. Up.Braguvalli, Anuvak—1.
44. 'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत् । ततो वै सदजायत '। T. Up., B.V. An.7-1
45. 'अजामेकां लोहित शुक्ल कृष्णां वह्वीः प्रजाः सृजमानां सरूपाः ।अजो ह्येको' जुषमाणोऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्त भोगामजोन्यः ॥ Shvet Up. 4—5 Also see S. P. 210
46. *Shvet. Up.* **4**—5
47 'श्रुतिरपि प्रधानकार्यत्वस्य' ।S. Su. 5—12
48. 'सोम्यान्नेन शुङ्गनापो मूलमन्विच्छाद्भिः सोम्य शुङ्गेन तेजा मूलमन्विच्छ तेजसा सोम्य शुङ्गेन सन्मूलमन्विच्छ सन्मूलाः सोम्येमाः सर्वाः प्रजा सदायतनाः सत्य प्रतिष्ठाः' ॥ Ch. Up. 6--8--4.
49. 'यस्तन्तुनाभ इव तन्तुभिः प्रधानजैः स्वभावतो देव एकः स्वमावृणोत् ।' Shevt. Up. 6–10.
50. 'ईश्वर नाम ब्रह्म का और ब्रह्म से भिन्न अनादि अनुत्पन्न और अमृत स्वरूप जीव का नाम जीव है ।' 'Dayananda, S.P. p. 197.
51. *M. Up. 3–1–1.*
52. 'शान्तं शिवमद्वैतं चतुर्थं मन्यन्ते स आत्मा स विज्ञेयः'। Mand. Up. 7
53. *Yoga-Sutra 3–5.*
54. *M. Up. 3–1–3.*
55. *Br. Up. 1*–4–10
56. *S. P. p. 193*
57. *Ibid. p. 194*

58. *Ibid. p.194*

59. *Shvet. Up. 5–9*

60. 'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद यस्यात्मा शरीरम्। आत्मनोन्तरो यमयति स त आत्मान्तर्याम्यमृतः'।

Dayananda has referred this verse to Brahadaranyakopnishad in his Satyarth Prakash on page 194. But this could not be traced in Br. Up. currently available. The verse has been traced by the author in Shatpath Brahaman of Madhyandini school of Yajurveda. Current Br. Up. belongs to **Shatpath Brahman of Kandva School. For the verse see Shatpath Brahaman 14-6-7.**

61. *Br. Up. 5–5–2.*

62. 'छायाऽऽतपौ ब्रह्मविदो वदन्ति ये च त्रिणाचिकेताः'। K. Up. 3-1.

63. *S. P. p. 306*

64. 'अजामेकां लोहित शुक्ल कृष्णां बह्वीः प्रजाः सृजमानां सरूपाः। अजोह्येको जुषमाणो ऽनुशेते जहात्येनां भुक्तभोगामजोऽन्यः'। Shvet. Up. 4–5.

65. *S. P p. 236*

66 *K. Up. 1–2–23.*

67. 'Salvation can only be attained through right action, right worship and right knowledge and non-righteous action, speech etc., worship of idols and false knowledge lead to bondage.' S. P. p. 237

68. 'ज्ञान कर्मणोविरोधं पर्वतवदकम्पयं न स्मरसि किम्'। from Shankar's commentary on Isopnishad verse 2.

69. *See commentary of Shankara on Isopnishad verse 8.*

70. *Ibid. P.18*

71. *S. P. p. 183*

72. *T. Up.* 1-*3-4*

73. 'The general impression that the Upanishads require worl denial is not quite correct.' **The Principal Upanishads,. p.106. S. Radhakrishnan.**

74. *Shevt. Up. 2-9*

75. *K. Up. 1-2-23*

76. *(i) M. Up. 2-2-4, and (ii) P. Up. 5-2*

77. *Shvet. Up. 2-1*

78. *M.Up.* 1-2-11

79 *P. Up. 5-7*

CHAPTER 3

1. 'नास्तिको वेद निन्दकः ' ।**Manu. 2-11**.
2. 'अल्पाक्षरमसन्दिग्धं सारवद्विश्वतोमुखम्।
   अस्तोभमनवद्यञ्च सूत्रं सूत्रविदो विदुः' ।
3. *S.P. p. 222.*
4. Sanskrit-Sahitya-Vimarsh, **p.255. Dwijendra Nath.**
5. *S.P., p.66*
6. (i) The Sacred Book of Hindu's, Vol. II Vaisheshika-Sutra; Introduction p.VIII. Edited by Major Vasu.
   (ii) Sanskrit-Sahitya-Vimarsh, p.256. **D**wijendra Nath.
   (iii)Patanjal-Yog-Pradeep.,. p.10 Omananda.
   (iv) Max Muller refers Vijyan Bhiksu. Indian Phil. Vol.I p.80 Six Systems.
7. Shankaracharya holds Vaisheshika and Nyaya as atheist systems along with Sankhya **See his commentary on Vedanta-Sutra 2-2-12**
8. *S.P. p.188*
9. *Vedant-Sutra.4-4.-10,11,14.*
10 *Sankhya-Sutra. 6-38,39.*
11 *Introduction p.VIII of the Sacred Book Of Hindu* Series, *Vaisheshika Sutra' Vol. VI.*
12. '(एवमेव खलु) सोम्यन्नेन.........सत्प्रतिष्ठा '।**Ch.Up 6-8-4,also S.P. p. 211**
13 *S.P. p.216*
14 (i) Gautam's Nyaya-Sutras, 4-1-14 **Vatsyayan Bhashya, Translated by Ganga Nath Jha**.
   (ii) Nyaya-Sutra of Gautama, 4-1-14 Translated by **Mahamhopadhyaya Satish Chandra Vidyabdushana.' The Secred Book of Hindu. Vol.VIII**
15.*Ibid 4-1-15.*
16. 'तदाश्रयत्वादऽप्रथग्ग्रहणम्। 'Nyaya -Sutra 4-2-28
17. *Indian Philosophy. Vol II. p.97. S.Radhakrishnan*
18. *Vaisheshika-Sutra. 9-1-1*
19. *Ibid. 10-2-1.*
20. *A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol.1 p.320.* S.N. *Dass Gupta*
21. 'कारणाऽभावात् कर्याऽभावः । Vaisheshika-Sutra,1-2-1
22. कारणगुणपूर्वकः कार्यगुणोदृष्टः। Vaisheshika-Sutra, 2-1-24

23. *S.P. p.220 & 22 3.*

24. नित्यायाः सत्वरजस्तमसां साम्यावस्थायाः प्रकृतेरुत्पन्नानां पृथक-पृथग्वर्तमानानां तत्त्वपरमाणूनां प्रथमः संयोगारम्भः संयोगविशेषादवस्थान्तरस्य स्थूलाकार प्राप्तिः सृष्टिरूच्यते '। S.P. p. **223**

25. *Gita.-Rahasya.p.175.*

26. The five classes of atoms are generated from tanmatras as follows.'

History of Indian Phil. Vol.1.p.252 S.N Dass Gupta.

27. *Patanjal-Yoga-Pa rdeep, p.98. Omananda*

28. *Sankhya-Sutra 6-38.*

29. *Ibid. 6-39.*

30. 'सत्त्वादीनि द्रव्याणि, न वैशेषिका गुणाः संयोग विभागत्वात्।' Vijyan Bhikshu, as referred by Tulsi Ram in his commentary on. Sankhya-Sutra p.28.

31. 'मूल प्रकृतिरविकृतिर्महदाद्या :प्रकृति विकृतयः सप्तः। षोडशकस्तु विकारो न प्रकृतिर्नविकृतिः पुरुषः।' Sankhya Karika.3.

32. *S.P. p.98.*

33. Bodhayana Muni's commentary on Braham-Sutra could not be traced out even after best efforts. But this cannot be doubted that such a commentary was composed because Ramanuja has remembered Bodhayana as a commentator on Braham-Sutra in his Sri Bhasya, a commentary on Braham-Sutra. 'भागवद् बोधायनम् कृतम् विस्तीर्ण. ब्रह्मसूत्र वृत्ति पूर्वाचार्यः। '

34. 'वैधर्म्याच्च न स्वप्नादिवत्'। Br.Su. 2-2-**29**

35. 'मायामात्रं तु कात्स्न्र्येनानभिव्यक्त स्वरूपत्वात्'।Br.Su. **3-2-3**

36. 'परमेश्वराधीनात्वियमस्माभिः प्रागवस्था जगतोऽभ्युपगम्यते न स्वतन्त्रा। सा चाऽवश्यसमभ्युपगन्तव्या। अर्थवती हि सा। न हि तया विना परमेश्वरस्य स्रष्टृत्वं सिध्यति।' From Shankara's commentary on Br.Su.1-4-3

37. 'प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्"। Br.Su.1-4-23

38. Patanjal-Yoga-Pradeep, ,p.21, Omananda

39. *Ibid. p.22*

40. 'I donot know of any Hindu writer previous to Gaudapada who attempted to give an exposition of the monistic doctrine (apart from Upanishads) either by writing a commentary as did Shankara by writing an independent work] as did Gaudpada.

A History of Indian Philosophy.Vol.1.p.422.S.N.Dass Gupta

41. *S.P.p.306*

42. 'इतश्चानन्दमयः पर एवात्मा नेतरः इत्तर ईश्वरादन्य जीव इत्यर्थ,'। From Shankara's commentary on Br. Su. 1-1-16

43. 'Since thus the plurality of the eternal individual self rests on good authority, .. . **Sacred Book of the Fast Series, Vol. XL VIII, Vedanta Sutras 2-3-43, commented by Ramanuja. Translated by Thibaut.**
44. S. P. p. 306, for explanation of these aphorisms.
45. 'अधिकन्तु भेदनिर्देशात्' । Br. Su. 2-1-22.
46. Br. Su. 1-2-20 & 1-2-22.
47. 'नाणुरतच्छ्रुतेरिति चेन्नेतराधिकारात् ।' Br. Su. 2-3-21. Ramanuja also regards the jiva as atomic, in his commentary on the above mentioned aphorism.
48. Br. Su. 4-4-10.
49. Ibid. 4-4-11.
50. Ibid. 4-4-12.
51. 'जगद्व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणाद संनिहितत्वाच्च' । Br. Su. 4-4-17. Also see Br. Su. 1-1-16
52. S. P. p. 188
53. Shet Up. 5-2.
54. 'Both Asuri and Panchshikha adhere to a theistic Sankhya and believe in supremacy of Brahman.' **Indian Phil. Vol. II p. 253. S. Radhakrishnan.**
55. Gita-Rahasya. p. 162, B. G. Tilak. (F. Note)
56. Bhagvat. 1-3-10
57. 'कालार्क भक्षितम् सांख्यशास्त्रं ज्ञानसुधारकम् । कलावशिष्टं भूयोऽपि पूरयिष्ये वचोऽमृतैः' । From Introduction to Sankhya-Pravachan-Bhasya. Vijyan Bhikshu.
58. S. P. p. 66
59. S. Su. 1-92
60. 'यहां ईश्वर की सिद्धि में प्रत्यक्ष प्रमाण नहीं है और न जगत् का उपादान कारण है' । S. P. p. 187.
61. 'व्यावृतोभयरूप: । S. Su. 1-160.
62. (i) 'साक्षात्सम्बन्धात् साक्षित्वम्' । S. Su. 1-161.
    (ii) 'नित्यमुक्तत्वम्' । S. Su. 1-162.
63. 'अकार्यत्वेऽपि तद्योगः पारवश्यात्' । S. Su. 3-55.
64. 'स हि सर्ववित् सर्वकर्त्ता' । S. Su. 3-56.
65. 'ईदृशेश्वर सिद्धिः सिद्धा' । S. Su. 3-57.
66. 'न ईश्वरधिष्ठिते फलनिष्पत्तिः कमर्णा तत्सिद्धेः' । S. Su, 5-2.

67. 'समाधि सुषुप्ति मोक्षेषु ब्रह्मरूपता' । S. Su. 5-116.

68. 'Vedant philosophy also accepts the presence of intelligence in the State of liberation' See V. Su. 4-4-10, 11 & 12.

69. 'निजशक्त्यभिव्यक्तेः स्वतः प्रामाण्यम्' । S. Su. 5-51.

70. It appears that Sankhya philosophy would have been regarded as theistic before the middle ages, and some theistic commentaries would have been written on it, none of which is available now. In his Satyarth Prakash Dayananda has referred to one such commentary written by Bhaguri Muni. This also is not available. Dayananda accepts it authentic on Sankhya. Writer

CHAPTER—4

1. S. P. p. 176
2. Ibid. p. 176–177
3. Ibid. p. 436
4. Ibid p. 220
5. Ibid p. 220–221
6. Ibid p. 220
7. Ibid p. 443
8. History of Western Philosophy. B Russell, p. 191
9. S. P. p. 201
10. S. P. p. 186
11. ईश्वर का स्वभाविक गुण जगत् की उत्पत्ति करके सब को जीवों असंख्य पदार्थ देकर परोपकार करना है' । S.P. p. 215.
12. 'ईश्वरः कारणं पुरुष कर्माफल्य दर्शनात्' । N. Su. 4-1-19.
13. S. P. p. 441
14. 'That the world is an effect, and as such must have been produced by an intelligent person who had a direct knowledge of the materials. He also has a direct knowledge of dharam (merit) and adharam (demerit) of men, in accordance with which, He creates the whole world and estab-

lishes an order by which everyman may have only such experiences as he deserves. He by His mere desire, sets all the world in motion. He has no body but still He carries on the functioning of His infinite knowledge and power, otherwise how could. He create this world and establish its order'. **(A History of Indian Philosophy) Vol. 3 P. 153, S. N. Dass Gupta.**

15. S. P. p. 203–204.
16. 'स पूर्वेषामपि गुरुः कालेनानवच्छेदात्' । Y. Su. 1-26.
17. S P. p. 440
18. Ibid. p. 64
19. 'ओइम् खं ब्रह्म' । Yajurveda, 40-17.
20. (i) 'तत्ते पदं संग्रहेण ब्रवीम्योमित्येतत्' । K. Up. 1-2-15.
    (ii) 'ओमित्येतदक्षरमुद्गीथमुपासीत' । Ch Up. 1-1-1.
21. S. P. p. 1
22. 'ऋचो अक्षरे परमे व्योमन्यस्मिन् देवा अधि विश्वे निषेदुः' ।
    Rig. Veda. 1-164-39.
23. S. P. p. 215
24. S. P. p. 215
25. 'He cannot under the past, commit sin, make another God or make Himself not exist.' **History of Western Philosophy; B. Russell. p. 480**
26. Ibid p. 480
27. "Well, but can you imagine that God will be willing to lie, whether in words or deeds, or to put forth a phantom of Himself'? 'I can not saw, he replied". **See Republic in Five Dialogues; p. 285, Plato. Translated by B. Jowett. Published by Walter J. Black.**
28. S. P. p. 238
29. S. P. p. 177
30. S. P. p. 192
31. S. P. p. 186
32. "But experience has shown that the mechanistic question leads to scientific knowledge, while the teleological question does not." **A History of Western Philosophy, by B. Russell, P. 87, 1946**

33. S. P. p. 177
34. S. P. p. 443
35. 'लोकवत्तु लीला कैवल्यम्' ।

V. Su. 2-1-33. See Ramanuja on it.

36. S. P. p. 200
37. S. P. p. 324
38. 'न तस्य प्रतिमा अस्ति' । Yajurveda 32-3,
39. S. P. p. 318
40. Ibid , p. 15
41. Ibid., .p 53–54
42. Ibid., p. 184
43. Ibid., p. 190
44. Ibid., p. 180
45. Ibid., p. 189
46. 'स पर्य्यगाच्छुक्रमकायमव्रणमस्नाविरं शुद्धमपापविद्धम्' ।

Yajur Veda, 40-8

47. सर्वज्ञो वीतरागादिदोषस्त्रैलोक्यपूजितः ।
यथास्थितार्थवादी च देवोऽर्हन् परमेश्वरः' ॥
चन्द्रसूरि के आप्तनिश्चयालंकार से, स० प्रकाश पृ० 438 पर उद्धृत ।
48. S. P. p. 438–438
49. Ibid., p. 208
50. Ibid., p. 208
51. Ibid., p. 174
52. Greek philosopher Xenophanes had also put forward the concept of monotheism as against polytheism. **See 'A History of Philosophy.'** p. **36, Frank Thilly. 1955.**
53. S. P. p. 174
54. Nirukta, 7–15
55. Ken up. 1–5
56. Shatpath Brahman. 14–4
57. **Encyclopedia of Religon and Ethics.**

"In Fact at the close of history of Great Philosophy this third form of monotheism appeared as a part of the Neo-Platonic Philosophy." **Page–819. (Monotheism)**

"The name 'acosmism', therefore, is more suggestive for it than the name Pantheism." **(Ibid)**

58. 'ईश्वर अपने काम अर्थात् उत्पत्ति, पालन, प्रलय आदि और सब जीवों के पुण्य पाप की यथा योग्य व्यवस्था करने में किंचित् भी सहायता नहीं लेता अर्थात् अपने अनन्त सामर्थ्य से ही सब अपना काम पूर्ण कर लेता है'।
S. P., p. 179.
59. S. P., p. 198
60. A History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. III, p. 153, S. N. Dass Gupta–1940
61. S P, p. 20')
62. 'जीवेशौ च विशुद्धा चिद्विभेदस्तु तयोर्द्वयोः।
अविद्या तच्चितोर्योगः षडस्माकमनादयः॥'
This Shloka is found in 'Sidhant Lesh Sangrah' p. 62, published under Achuta Granthmala Kashi.
63. S. P. p. 196
64. See Sankara's commentary on Mandukya Karika no. 2-32 of Gaudpada.
65. Nyaya Sudha. p. 124 of Jaiteerth.
66. The Vedant Philosophy, p. 72, Max Muller, 2nd reprint Cal–1955
67. S. P. p. 238
68. 'य आत्मनि तिष्ठन्नात्मनोन्तरो यमात्मा न वेद अस्य आत्मा शरीरम्'।
Br. Up. 3-7-22 of Madhyandini School of Shatpath Brahman—14-6-7.
69. S. P. p. 316

CHAPTER—5

1. 'इयं कल्याण्य जरा मर्त्यस्यामृता गृहे'। Atharveda 10-8-26.
2. Ch. Up. 8-7-12
3. 'अत्र चत्वारि भूतानि भूमिर्वायुरनलोनिला। चतुर्भ्यः खलु भूतेभ्यश्चैतन्यमुपजायते॥ किण्वादिभ्यः समेतेभ्यो द्रव्येभ्यो मदशक्तिवत्'।
('Sarva–Darshan–Sangraha' Charvaka Darshan)
4. S. P. p. 422

5. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, p. 8, Vol. VIII. Edited by James Hastings 1915.
6. Br. Su. 1–1–4. Shankar's commentary on it.
7. 'Radhakrishnan' p. 233, by Several Contributors, London, 1951.
8. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, p. 8 Vol. VIII, Ed. by James Hastings—1915.
9. S. P. p. 210
10. 'ईश्वर नाप ब्रह्म का और ब्रह्म से भिन्न अनादि, अनुत्पन्न और अमृत स्वरूप जीव का नाम जीव है' । S. P. p. 197.
11. 'The soul is not transmitted with semen but is created afresh with each man.' History of Western Phil , B. Russell. p. 480, Lodon, 1947.
12. 'Descartes admitted three substances, God and mind and matter, it is true that even for him God was in a sense more substantial than mind and matter, since He had created them and could, if He chose, annihilate them.' Ibid. p. 594.
13. Mandukya–Karika, Vaitathya Prakaran, 32. Guadpada-charaya.
14. S. P. p. 191
15. N. Su. 1–1–10, also see commentary of Vatsyayan and Nayayavartika.
16. S. P., p. 191 and 400
17. 'क्योंकि जीव का परम अवधि तक ज्ञान बढ़े तो भी परिमित ज्ञान और सामर्थ्य वाला होता है । अनन्त ज्ञान और सामर्थ्य वाला नहीं हो सकता' । S. P. p. 221
18. S. P., p. 237
19. Ibid., p. 236
20. Ibid., p. 210
21. Ibid., p. 249
22. K. Up. 3–3, 4, 5
23. K. Up. 3–9
24. S. P., p. 192
25. Ibid., p. 453

26. (i) 'ऐषोऽणुरात्मा चेतसा वेदितव्यो' । M. Up., 3-1-9.
(ii) Br. Su., 2--3-49

27. 'वालाग्रशतभागस्य शतधा कल्पितस्य च । भागो जीवः सविज्ञेयः स चानन्त्याय कल्पते' ॥ Shut. Up. 5-9, see Sankara's commentary also.

28 (i) 'जो मुक्ति में के कोई भी लौटकर जीव इस संसार में न आवे तो संसार का उच्छेद अर्थात् निश्शेष हो जाना चाहिये' । S. P., p. 246.
(ii) जन्मादि व्यवस्थातः पुरुष बहुत्वम्' । S. Su. 1-149.
(iii) 'व्यवस्थातो नाना' । V. Su., 3-2 20.

29. 'The soul of animals, unlike those of man, are not immortal'. A History of Western Philosophy, by B. Russell. p. 480.

30. A History of Indian Phil., Vol. IV, p. 155-156 S. N. Dass Gupta.

31. S. P., p. 255

32. S. P., p. 255

33. S. P., p. 237

34. S. Su., 1-49 & 1-15

35. 'जीव कर्मों का साक्षी नहीं किन्तु कर्त्ता भोक्ता है' । S.P., p. 238.

36. S. P., p. 259

37. S. P , p. 401

38. S. P., p. 248

39. '(प्रश्न) बन्ध व मोक्ष स्वभाव से होता है या निमित्त से ?
(उत्तर) निमित्त से, क्योंकि जो स्वभाव से होता तो बन्ध व मुक्ति की निवृत्ति कभी नहीं होती' । S. P. p. 237.

40. S. P., p. 241

41. S. P., p. 241

42. R. B. B., p. 171

43. S. P., p. 180

44. S. P., p. 241

45. S. Su. 1-1

46. Y. Su. Sadhan-Pada, Sutra 16, 17, 24, 25 & 26

47. S. P., p. 236

48. S. P., p. 236

49. 'नित्य प्रति न्यून से न्यून दो घन्टा पर्यन्त मुमुक्षु ध्यान अवश्य करें जिससे भीतर के मन आदि पदार्थ साक्षात् हों' । S. P. p. 250.
Also see S.P. p. 180.

50. S. P., p. 256
51. Ibid. 256
52. Ibid. 257
53. History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. IV, p. 318, S. N. Dass Gupta.
54. S. P., p. 251
55. S. P., p. 248
56. 'अभावंबादरिराह ह्येवम्' । Br. Su. 4-4-10.
57. 'भावं जैमिनिर्विकल्पामननात्' । Br. Su. 4-4-11.
58. 'द्वादशाहवदुभयविधं वादरायणोऽत:' । Br. Su., 4-4-12.
59. S. P., p. 242 & 243
60. 'श्रृणवन् श्रोत्रं भवति···चेतयंश्चित्तम्भवत्यहं कुर्वाणोऽहंकारो भवति' । Shatpath Br., 14.
61. S. P., p. 248
62. 'तदाविद्वान्पुण्यपापे विधूय निरंजन: परमं साम्यमुपैति' । M. Up., 3-1-3.
63. 'स योहवै तत्परमं ब्रह्मवेद ब्रह्मैव भवति' । M. U., 3-2-9.
64. 'यद् गत्वा न निवर्तन्ते तद्धाम परमं मम' । Gita, 15-6.
65. S. P., p. 245
66. (i) 'तदत्यन्त विमोक्षोऽपवर्ग:' । N. Su., 1-1-22.
    (ii) 'अथ त्रिविध दुःखात्यन्तनिवृत्तिरत्यन्त पुरुषार्थ:' । S. Su., 1-1.
67. S. P., p. 245
68. 'स्यपादोऽय विश्वा भूतानि त्रिपादस्याऽमृतं दिवि' । Yajurveda, 31-3.
69. S. P., p. 246
70. (i) 'पुरुषबहुत्व व्यवस्थात्' । S. Su. 6-45.
    (ii) 'व्यवस्थातोनाना' । V. Su. 3-2-20.
71. 'ते ब्रह्मलोकेषु परान्तकाले परामृता: परिमुच्यन्ति सर्वे' । M. Up. 3-2-6
72. 'इदानीमिव सर्वत्र नात्यन्तोच्छेद: । S. Su., 1-159.
73. 'सर्वत्र काले बन्धस्यात्यन्तोच्छेद: कस्यापि पुंसो नास्ति' । Vijyan Bhikshu's Commentary on S. Su., 1-159.

74. (i) 'तेषां न पुनरावृत्ति' । Br. Up., 6-2-15.
    (ii) 'यस्माद् भूयो न जायते' । K. Up., 1-3-8.
    (iii) तस्मान्न पुनरावर्तन्त इत्येष निरोधः' । P. Up., 1-10.
75. 'तेषां सुखं शाश्वतं नेतरेषाम्' । K. Up., 2-2-12.
76. 'मामुपेत्य तु कौन्तेय पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते' । Gita, 816.
77. S. P., p. 196
78. S. P., p. 301
79. Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, p. 659, S. Radhakrishnan.
80. S. P., p. 300–301
81. S. P., p. 301
82. S. P., p. 301
83. S. P., p. 301
84. 'एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्या प्रत्ययरूपः' । From Shankara's Chatursutri on Br. Sutras.
85. 'सत्यद्वैतमिति श्रुतिकृतोविशेषो न स्यात्, सांख्यादि दर्शनेनाविशेषात्' । From Sankara's Commentary on Mandukyopnishad. 3.
86. 'छायाऽतपौ ब्रह्म विदो वदन्ति' । K. Up. 1-3-1.
87. History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. III, p. 413, S. N. Dass Gupta.
88. Indian Philosophy, Vol. II, p. 692. Dr. S. Radhakrishnan.
89. S. P., p. 305-306
90. 'जगद् व्यापारवर्जं प्रकरणादसन्निहितत्वाच्च' । Br. Su., 4-4-17.
91. 'भावं जैमिनि विकल्पामननात्' । Br. Su., 4-4-11.

CHAPTER—6

1. "Finding the whole visible sphere not at rest, but moving in an irregular and disorderly fashion, out of disorder he brought order." "Thus it appears that Plato's God unlike the Jewish and Christian God did not create the world out of nothing but re-arranged pre-existing matter." History of Western Philosophy, p., 165, B. Russell.

2. Introduction to Modern Philosophy, p. 10, C. E. M. Joad, 1953.
3. 'आत्मभूतनामरूपोपादान भूतः सन्सर्वज्ञो जगन्निर्मिमीत इत्यविरुद्धम्'। See Shankar's Commentary on A. Up. 1-1-2.
4. 'सलिलफेन स्थानीये आत्मभूते नामरूपे अव्याकृते आत्मैकशब्दवाच्ये व्याकृत फेन स्थानीयस्य जगतः उपादान भूते संभवतः। Ibid.
5. Madyamik-Vrat, 14-8
6. Ibid., 13-8
7. See Mandukya-Karika, 2-12, Shankar's commentary.
8. See Mandukya-Karika, 1-17, Sankar's commentary.
9. 'अतः सा प्रत्यक् चित्ति ब्रह्मस्वरूपावभासं प्रतिबाध्नाति अंहकारादि अतद्रूप प्रतिभास निमित्तं च भवति'। Panchpadika, p. 5 Vijaygram Sanskrit Series, Cal.
10. Ibid. p. 13
11. 'अविद्या सहित ब्रह्मोपादानम्'। Br. Su. 1-1-2, From Bhamati on Shankar's Commentary on it.
12. Sankchep Saririka, p. 333-334 Bhau Shastri Ed.
13. 'Individual souls have their own illusions of the world and these through similarity appear to be the permanent world'. **A History of Indian Phil.**, Vol. III, p. 198, S. N. Dass Gupta.
14. S. P., p. 218
15. S. P., p. 219
16. S. P., p. 219
17. See Sankar's commentary on Mandukya-Karika 2-32.
18. Encyclopedia Britannica, Vol. 12, p. 66 published in 1960.
19. S. P., p. 209-210
20. 'ईश्वर, जीव जगत् का कारण ये तीन अनादि हैं'। S. P., p. 209.
21. S. P., p. 213
22. S. P., p. 195
23. Shvet. Up., 4-5
24. '(एवमेव खलु) सोम्यान्नेन······सत्प्रतिष्ठा'। Ch. Up. 6-8-4. For Dayananda's explanation see S. P., p. 211.

25. 'असद्वा इदमग्र आसीत्' । T. Up., 2-7-1.
26. 'सदेव सौम्येदमग्र आसीत्' । Ch.Up., 6-2.
27. 'मायां तु प्रकृतिं विद्यान्मायिनं तु महेश्वरम्' । Shvet. Up. 4-10.
28. 'अजामेकां लोहित शुक्ल कृष्णां' । Shvet. Up. 4-5.
29. 'यस्मान्मायी सृजते विश्वमेतत् । तस्मिन्श्चान्यो मायया सं निरुद्धः' । Shvet. Up. 4-9.
30. Br. Su., 3-2-2
31. Ibid., 3-2-3
32. Ibid., 2-2-29
33. 'प्रकृतिश्च प्रतिज्ञादृष्टान्तानुपरोधात्' ।। Br. Su. 1-4-23.
34. 'सत्वरजस्तमसां साम्यावस्था प्रकृति .... ' । See Dayananda on this aphorism in S. P., p. 210.
35. S. P., p. 212
36. V. Su., 4-1-3
37. Ibid., 1-2-2
38. S. P., p. 58
39. 'अनिच्चावत् संखारा' । Anguttar Nikay, as referred by Balder Updhyaya in his book 'Baudha Darshan Aur Anya Bhartiya Darshan' on p. 701 Vol. I.
40. 'सत्वैभव अनिच्चा दुखा विपरिणामधम्मा' । अंगुत्तर निकाय, 4-19-5.
41. 'यथा बब्बलूकं पस्से यथा पस्से मरीचिकं । एवं लोकमवेक्खन्तं मच्चु राजा न पस्सति' । Dhampada, 93-4.
42. 'Udyana' VIII 3, as quoted by Dr. S. Radhakrishnan in his book Indian Philosophy, Vol. I, page 379-380
43. S. P., p. 218
44. "..........we cannot think of change without a permanent. It is the truth contained in Kant's Second Analogy of Experience. **Without the permanent no relation in time are possible**". Indian Philosophy, Vol. I p. 376-377 S. Radhakrishnan.
45. S. P., p. 224
46. S. P., p. 54

47. R. B. B., p. 126 & 149
48. V. Su., 2-2-15 and 16.
49. S. P., 54.
50. S. P., 54.
51. 'वास्तव में आकाश की उत्पत्ति नहीं होती, क्योंकि बिना आकाश के प्रकृति और परमाणु कहां ठहर सकें' । S. P. p. 222.
52. A History of Western Philosophy, p. 241, B. Russell.
53. S. P., p. 192
54. 'But these, space and time, which are limited, are produced from akasha through the conjunction of this or that, limiting objects (upadhi)'. As quoted by S. Radhakrishnan in Indian Phil., Vol. II p. 277.
55. S. P., p. 217
56. S. P., p. 211
57. S. P., p. 214
58. '(सत्व) शुद्ध (रजः) मध्य (तमः) जाड्य अर्थात् जड़ता तीन मिलाकर जो एक संघात है उसका नाम प्रकृति है' । S. P., p. 210.
59. 'सत्त्वादीनामतद्धर्म्मत्वम् तद्रूपत्वात्' । S. Su. 6.39.
60. S. P., p. 208
61. S. P., p. 220
62. S. P., p. 220-221
63. S. P., p. 210
64. S. P., p. 210
65. Sankhya-Karika 3.
66. 'A different view of gunas is found in Vijyan Bhikshu who regards them as subtle entities, infinite in number according to the diversity of individuals'. **Indian Phil.**, Vol. 2 p. 265, S. Radhakrishnan.
67. 'परमाणवोऽपि नासन्' । R B. B, p. 122.
68. 'नित्यायाः सत्वरजस्तमसां साम्यावस्थायाः प्रकृतेरुत्पन्नानां पृथक्-पृथक् वर्तमानानां तत्त्वपरमाणूनां प्रथमः संयोगारम्भः संयोग विशेषादवस्थान्तरस्य स्थूलाकार प्राप्तिः सृष्टिरुच्यते' । S. P, p. 223.

69. S. P., p. 222
70. S. Su., 5–87
71. S. P., p. 230
72. 'तस्माद्वा··· · पुरुषोऽन्नरसमयः' । T. Up· 2-1.
73. S. P., p. 232
74. R. B. B., p. 145
75. R. B. B., p. 145 to 148
76. S. P., p. 232
77. R. B. B., p. 148 & S. P., p. 232 & 233
78. 'तारों की विचित्र दशा है। उनकी परिभाषा ही गलत हो गयी। समझा जाता था कि ग्रह चलते हैं, तारा अचल हैं। पर यह ठीक नहीं है। तारे भी चलते हैं, हमारा सूर्य अपने सारे कुटुम्ब के साथ उस दिशा में चला जा रहा है जिधर अभिजित नक्षत्र है।······सूर्य भी किसी बिन्दु की परिक्रमा कर रहा होगा। इसकी परिक्रमा करने में सूर्य को 20 करोड़ वर्ष लगते हैं।' **सूचना पंचांग**, सम्वत् 2016, पृ० 39, सूचना विभाग, उत्तर प्रदेश सरकार, लखनऊ।
79. R. B. B., p. 136
80. (i) R. B. B., p. 128
    (ii) 'अनन्त परमात्मा के सम्मुख असंख्यात् लोक एक परमाणु के तुल्य भी नहीं कहे जा सकते'। S. P., p. 231.
81. सूचना पंचांग, पृ० 40, सम्वत् 2016, उ० प्र० सरकार लखनऊ, सूचना विभाग द्वारा प्रकाशित।
82. S. P., p. 234
83. S. P., p. 234

CHAPTER—7

1. S. P., p. 422
2. Ibid., p. 428
3. See Sankar's commentary on Br. Su. 2–2–28 & 2–2–29.
4. S. P., p. 428 & 429
5. Ibid., p. 219

6. 'अविद्या कल्पितम् वेद्यवेदितृवेदिनादभेदम्' । Sankara on Br. Su. 1-1-4.
7. 'जाग्रद् दृश्यानां भावानां वैतथ्यमिति प्रतिज्ञा । दृश्यत्वादिति हेतुः । स्वप्न-दृश्यभाववदिति दृष्टान्तः । यथा तत्र स्वप्ने दृष्यानां भावानां वैतथ्यं तथा जाग्ररितेऽपि दृश्यत्वमविशिष्टमिति हेतूपनयः । तस्माज्जागरितेऽपि वैतथ्यं स्मृतमिति निगमनम् ।' Shankara's explanation of Mandukya-karika 2-4
8. Indian Epistemology, p. 314, by Jwala Prasad.
9. S. P., p. 218-219
10. Ibid., p. 57
11. Ibid., p. 49
12. Ibid , S. P., p 50
13. Ibid., p. 176
14. Ibid., p. 50
15. Ibid., p. 60
16. Ibid., p. 50-51
17. Ibid., p. 51
18. Ibid., p. 51
19. Ibid., p. 51
20. S. P., p. 51-52
21. S. P., p. 52
22. S. P., p. 52
23. S. P., p. 52
24. 'जो श्रोत्र, त्वचा······उसको प्रत्यक्ष कहते हैं' । S P. p. 176
25. 'इन्द्रियार्थ पंचत्वात्' । N. Su. 3-1-61.
26. 'अविद्यावद् विषयाण्येव प्रत्यक्षादीनि प्रमाणानि शास्त्राणिचेति' । From Chatu Sutri of Shankara.
27. 'Sri Bhashya', p. 55 as quoted by the writer of 'Indian Epistemology', p. 329-330. Jwala Prasad.
28. S. P., p. 59
29. 'इन्द्रियदोषत्संस्कार दोषाच्चाविद्या' । V. Su. 9-2-10. on it Dayananda, S.P. p. 59.
30. S. P., p. 236

31. 'किन्तु विद्याविपरीतं ज्ञानान्तरमविद्येति'। Y. Su. 2-5. Vyas' Bhashya.
32. 'तद् दुष्टम् ज्ञानम्'। V.Su. 9-2-11.
33. 'तद्योगोऽप्यविवेकान्नसमानत्वम्'। S. Su. 1-55.
34. S. Su. 1-57
35. 'वाङ्मात्रं न तु तत्व चित्तस्थितेः'। S. Su. 1-58.
36. 'एवमयमनादिरनन्तो नैसर्गिकोऽध्यासो मिथ्याप्रत्ययरूपः'। From Chatu-Sutri of Shankara.
37. S. P., Introduction p. 2
38. Ibid., p. 237
39. Ibid., p. 59
40. Indian Psychology, Perception. Vol. I, p. 274, J. N. Sinha.
41. Ibid., p. 275
42. Indian Philosophy, Vol. 2, p. 132, S. Radhakrishnan.
43. 'अध्यासो नामातस्मिन्तद् बुद्धि'। From Introduction to the Commentory of Br. Su. by Shankara.
44. Indian Psychology, Perception. Vol. I, 295. J. N. Sinha.
45. S. p., p. 236
46. M. Up., 2-2-8
47. 'वेत्ति यथावत्तत्त्व पदार्थ स्वरूपं यया सा विद्या'। S. P. p. 236.
48. V. Su., 9-2-11
49. Yajur-Veda, 40-14 on it see Dayananda in S. P., p. 236.

CHAPTER—8

1. 'युञ्जते मन उत युञ्जते धियो विप्रा विप्रस्य बृहतो विपश्चितः'। Rig-Veda, 4-4-24-1.
2. 'अन्तःकरण अर्थात् मन, बुद्धि, चित्त, अंहकार से संकल्प-विकल्प, निश्चय,

स्मरण और अभिमान का करने वाला दण्ड और मान्य का भागी होता है'।
S. P., p. 238.

3. 'उभयात्मकं मनः' । S. Su., 2-26.
4. S. P., p. 248
5. Ibid., p. 248
6. Ibid., p. 248
7. Ibid., p. 248
8. Ibid., p. 249
9. 'वैसे प्राण भी जड़ है······ । वैसे ही मन भी जड़ है न उनको हर्ष, न शोक हो सकता है किन्तु मन से हर्ष, शोक, दुःख-सुख का भोग जीव करता है' । S. P., p. 238.
10. 'जो श्रोत्र, त्वचा, चत्रु, जिह्वा और घ्राण का शब्द, स्पर्श, रूप, रस और गन्ध के साथ अव्यवहित अर्थात् आवरणरहित सम्बन्ध होता है, इन्द्रियों के साथ मन का और मन के साथ आत्मा के संयोग से ज्ञान उत्पन्न होता है'। S. P. p., 50.
11. S. P , p. 182
12. **Sankhya Karika no. 25, Ishwar Krishna,** Also see Sankhya-Tatva-Kaumudi, a commentary by Vachaspati Misra on it.
13. S. P., p. 259
14. S. P., p. 259
15. S. P., p. 259–260
16. S P., p. 274
17. S P., p. 261
18. S. P., p. 262
19. R. B. B., p. 178–179
20. Ibid., p. 178
21. S. P., p. 236
22. S. P., p. 250
23. R. B. B., p. 197
24. Yoga-Sutra, 1–2
25. Yoga-Sutra, 1–1, See Vyas' Bhashya on it.

26. Yoga-Sutra, 1–3
27. R. B. B., p. 177
28. Yajurveda, 31–18
29. 'अभ्यास वैराग्याभ्याम् तन्निरोधः' । Yoga-Sutra, 1-12, See Vyas-Bhasya.
30. 'असंशयो महाबाहो मनो दुर्निग्रहं चलम् ।
    अभ्यासेन तु कौन्तेय वैराग्येण च गृह्यते' ॥ Gita 6-35.
31. 'The meaning is that so much.........as does not cause the disturbances of the equilibrium of physiological forces'. **Vachaspati Gloss** on Vyas, in Bhashya on Yoga-Sutra 1–12 Edt. by Maj: B. D. Vasu.
32. 'ईश्वरप्रणिधानं सर्व क्रियाणां परमगुरावर्पणं' । Yoga-Sutra 2-1 Vyas' Bhashya.
33. R. B. B., p. 179
34. (i) R. B. B., p. 181 to 183.
    (ii) Yoga-Sutra, 1–30 & 31.
35. 'तत्प्रतिषेधार्थमेकतत्त्वाऽभ्यासः' । Yoga-Sutra, 1-32.

CHAPTER 9

1. 'Regard all your actions as determined by Bhagwan or God as the ultimate subject or Karta'. The Ethical Philosophy of the Gita, p. 100, P. N. Srinivasachari.
2. Ibid., p. 102
3. 'समोऽहं सर्व भूतेषु' । Gita, 9-29.
4. S. P., p. 191
5. S. P., p. 183
6. Gita-Rahasya, p. 269–270 B. G. Tilak
7. 'पुरुषार्थ प्रारब्ध से बड़ा इसलिये है कि जिससे संचित प्रारब्ध बनते,

जिसके सुधारने से सब सुधरते और जिसके बिगाड़ने से सब बिगड़ते हैं, इसी से प्रारब्ध की अपेक्षा पुरुषार्थ बड़ा है'। Dayananda, Sva-mantavya-amantavya-prakash no. 25.

8. 'प्रश्न—क्या स्तुति आदि करने से ईश्वर अपना नियम छोड़ स्तुति, प्रार्थना करने वाले के पाप छुड़ा देता है। (दया०) उत्तर— नहीं'। S. P., p. 179.
9. S. P., p. 190
10. Mandukya-Karika, 2–32, by Gaudapada.
11. S. P., p. 197
12. 'वैराग्य अर्थात् जो विवेक से सत्यासत्य को जाना हो, उसमें से सत्याचरण का ग्रहण और असत्याचरण का त्याग करना विवेक है। जो पृथिवी से लेके परमेश्वर पर्यन्त पदार्थों के गुण, कर्म, स्वभाव से जानकर, उसकी आज्ञा पालन और उपासना में तत्पर होना··· विवेक कहलाता है'। S.P., p. 249.
13. S. P., p. 241
14. 'दुखादुद्विजते सर्वः सर्वस्य सुखमभीप्सितम्'। Mahabharata, Shanti-Parva, 139-62.
15. अथत्रिविध दुःखात्यन्त निवृत्तिरत्यन्त पुरुषार्थ'। S. Su. 1-1.
16. 'Further Kant considers that though the virtuous man does not aim at happiness, yet the complete well-being of a human being includes happiness as well virtue'. **A Manual of Ethics**, p. 192. J. S. Mackenjie. 1929.
17. 'भोगानभुक्ता वयमेवभुक्ताः तपो न तप्तं वयमेव तप्ताः। कालो न यातो वयमेवयातास्तृष्णा न जीर्णा वयमेव जीर्णाः'। **Vairagya Shatakam.** 12. Bhartrihari.
18. 'विषयरूपी सुखमात्र को पुरुषार्थ का फल मानकर विषय दुःख निवारण मात्र में कृतकृत्यता और स्वर्ग मानना मूर्खता है'। S. P., p. 423.
19. 'न शक्यते वर्णयितुं गिरा तदा स्वयन्तदन्तःकरणेन गृहते'। S.P. p. 184.
20. See Ninth Tenet of Arya Samaj. **Dayananda.**
21 (i) 'पीत्वा पीत्वा पुनः पीत्वा यावत्पतति भूतले। पुनरुत्थाय वै पीत्वा पुनर्जन्म न विद्यते'। Maha-Nirvana-Tantra 7-100.

(ii) 'मातृयोनिं परित्यज्य विहरेत् सर्वयोनिषु'। Jyan-Sankalini-Tantra.

22. S. P., p. 41

23. 'अकामस्य क्रिया काचिद् दृश्यते नेह कर्हिचित् । यद्यद्धि कुरुत किंचित् तत्तत्कामस्य चेष्टितम्' । Manu. 2-4, S.P., p. 47.

24. 'जो मनुष्य विद्या और अविद्या के स्वरूप को साथ ही साथ जानता है वह विद्या अर्थात् कर्मोपसना से मृत्यु, को तर के विद्या अर्थात् यथार्थ ज्ञान से मोक्ष को प्राप्त होता है' । S. P., p. 236.

25. 'ज्ञानान्मुक्तिः' S. Su. 3-23.

26. 'यथार्थ दर्शनं ज्ञानमिति' । S. P., p. 186.

27. S. P., p. 266-267

28. S. P., p. 236

29. 'यतोऽभ्युदय निःश्रेयस सिद्धिः स धर्मः' । V. Su. 1-1-2.

30. 'यस्याचरणादभ्युदयः सांसारिकमिष्टसुखं सम्यक् प्राप्तं भवति, येन च निःश्रेयसं पारमार्थिकं मोक्षसुखं च, स एव धर्मो विज्ञेयः । अतो विपरीतोह्यधर्मश्च' । R. B. B. 121.

31. S. P., p. 48 and Manusmriti, 2-12

32. 'मनुष्य का आत्मा सत्यासत्य का जानने वाला है । तथापि अपने प्रयोजन की सिद्धि, हठ, दुराग्रह और अविद्यादि दोषों से सत्य को छोड़ के असत्य में झुक जाता है' । S. P. Introduction.

33. Dayananda-Grantha-Mala, p. 210-211

34. M. Up., 3-1-5

35. M. Up., 3-1-6

36. R. B. B., 118

37. S. P., p. 41

38. S. P., p. 91.

39. Gita, 4-16

40. Seventh tenet of Arya Samaj, Dayananda.

41. 'जो उसको (शत्रु को) बन्दीगृह करे तो भी उसका सत्कार यथा-योग्य रखे । ......कभी उसको चिढ़ावे नहीं, न हंसी और न ठट्टा करे, न उसके सामने, हमने तुमको पराजित किया है, ऐसा भी कहे, किन्तु आप हमारे भाई हैं । इत्यादि मान्य प्रतिष्ठा सदा करें' । S. P., p. 160.

TENETS OF ARYA SAMAJ :

1. God is the first cause of all true knowledge and things that are known through knowledge.

2. God is existent, pure consciousness and blissful. He formless, omnipotent, just. merciful, unborn, infinite, unmixed, without begining, unique, basis of all, supreme, all-pervading, immanent. changeless, immortal, fearless, eternal, pure and the creator of creation He (God) alone should be worshipped.

3. Vedas are the source of all true sciences. Therefore, study and teaching, hearing and telling of Vedas is the prime duty of all Aryans.

4. One should always be ready to accept the truth and renounce untruth.

5. One should do all actions according to righteousness (dharam), i.e. after proper deliberation over truth and untruth.

6. The primary object of this society is to do good to the whole world i e. bodily, spiritual and social good.

7. One should behave with all beings with love, according to righteousness (dharam) and accordingly.

8. One should promote knowledge and dispel ignorance.

9. One should not remain satisfied with his own welfare only, but instead he should see his own welfare in the welfare of others.

10. All should feel under obligation to follow altruistic rulings of society, while in individual welfare all should be free.

TENETS OF ARYA SAMAJ :

1. God is the first cause of all true knowledge and things that are known through knowledge.

2. God is existent, pure consciousness and blissful. He formless, omnipotent, just. merciful, unborn, infinite, unmixed, without begining, unique, basis of all, supreme, all-pervading, immanent. changeless, immortal, fearless, eternal, pure and the creator of creation He (God) alone should be worshipped.

3. Vedas are the source of all true sciences. Therefore, study and teaching, hearing and telling of Vedas is the prime duty of all Aryans.

4. One should always be ready to accept the truth and renounce untruth.

5 One should do all actions according to righteousness (dharam), i.e. after proper deliberation over truth and untruth.

6. The primary object of this society is to do good to the whole world i e. bodily, spiritual and social good.

7. One should behave with all beings with love, according to righteousness (dharam) and accordingly.

8. One should promote knowledge and dispel ignorance.

9. One should not remain satisfied with his own welfare only, but instead he should see his own welfare in the welfare of others.

10. All should feel under obligation to follow altruistic rulings of society, while in individual welfare all should be free.

About the Author

Dr. Ved Prakash Gupta was born in a middle class family on 19th May, 1935. As a young student, having passed his intermediate, he came in close contact of Swami Atmananda Saraswati of Yamunanagar, a yogi, saint and renowned scholar of the Vedic literature. His association with the great yogi inculcated an abiding love in the author for Philosophy in general and Vedic philosophy in particular. He passed his M. A. in philosophy in the year 1958, from Meerut College, Meerut, then affiliated to Agra University.

During his student life the author came in contact of Arya Samaj. He was immensly influenced by the rationalism of Maharishi Dayananda. The author soon discovered that the rationalism of Dayananda provided anthentic and logical answers to many issues of philosophy, which hitherto remained unsolved even by the eminent and original thinkers of the world. Therefore, the author undertook this task of introducing Dayanand's philosophical acumen to the world. He submitted his thesis on Maharishi Dayananda's philosophy entitled "Adhunik Yug ko Maharishi Dayanada ki Darshnik Den" to Agra University for Ph. D. degree. The thesis was accepted and the degree was conferred on him.

Later, this thesis was published in the form of book entitled 'Dayananda Darshan' which received wide acclaim and appreciation from readers.

Dr. Ved Prakash Gupta is a teacher of philosophy in Meerut College, Meerut. He has been teaching philosophy in that College for last twenty years. He has been Convenor of Research Degree Committee and Board of Studies, Meerut University. He has lectured on Vedic philosophy in general and philosophy of Dayananda in particular in various congregations throughout the country.

INDO-VISION PRIVATE LIMITED
(Indological Publishers, Booksellers and Distributors)
II A-220, Nehru Nagar,
Ghaziabad-201001
U.P., India